PHILIPPINE HISTORICAL BULLETIN

HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Volume XVII Numbers 1 - 4

January–December 1973

THE NEW SOCIETY

THE STUDY AND TEACHING OF HISTORY

THE WRITING OF HISTORY

The Ford Report on the Situation
in the Philippines

The PHILIPPINE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Founded 1955

HONORARY OFFICERS:

H. E. President Ferdinand E. Marcos
Honorary President

Dr. Francisco Dalupan
Honorary Vice President

Prof. Gabriel F. Fabella
President Emeritus

OFFICERS FOR 1973:

President: Celedonio O. Resurreccion, *Far Eastern University*
Vice President: Julita R. Sta. Romana, *University of the East*
Treasurer: Filipinas E. Pineda, *University of the East*
Auditor: Ricardo A. Arcilla, *Bicol University*
Public Relations Officer: Marcelino A. Foronda, *De La Salle College*
Secretary: Ma. Minerva A. Gonzalez, *University of Sto. Tomas*

BOARD OF GOVERNORS:

The above officers and the following governors: Jose S. Arcilla, *Ateneo de Manila University;* Diosdado G. Capino, *Arellano University;* Paulino M. Capitulo, *Lyceum of the Philippines;* Mauro Garcia, *Jorge B. Vargas Filipiniana Foundation;* Gloria M. Santos, *Saint Mary's College, Q. C.*

Executive Secretary: Jorge L. Revilla, *University of the East*

BOARD OF EDITORS:

Diosdado G. Capino, *Arellano University*
Paulino M. Capitulo, *Lyceum of the Philippines*
Mauro Garcia, *Jorge B. Vargas Filipiniana Foundation*

The objects and purposes of the Association are (*a*) to promote and propagate historical knowledge and studies; (*b*) to collect and preserve relics, manuscripts, documents, and the like pertaining to the Philippines; and (*c*) to undertake any and other activities that will promote the objects and purposes of the Association. The regular membership fee in the Association is ₱10.00 a year which entitles a member to regular issues of the HISTORICAL BULLETIN free of charge. The life membership fee is ₱100.00.

Ambeth Ocampo

PHILIPPINE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Volume XVII / January – December 1973 / Nos. 1–4

CONTENTS

THE NEW SOCIETY

1 Towards a New Social Order
By Ferdinand E. Marcos

27 The Legal Background of Martial Law in the Philippines
By Juan Ponce Enrile

35 Government and Public Administration in Contemporary Society
By Gerardo P. Sicat

45 Scholarship in the New Society
By Onofre D. Corpus

THE STUDY AND TEACHING OF HISTORY

50 The Study and Interpretation of History
By Celedonio O. Resurreccion

67 The Study and Interpretation of History
By Samson A. Lucero

76 The Study of History
By Bonifacio S. Salamanca

83 The Study and Teaching of History
By Bonifacio S. Salamanca

93 The Teaching of History
By Gloria M. Santos

AMBETH R. OCAMPO

F
959.9
P538
1973

103 The Teaching of History
By Luis C. Dery

109 New Trends in Teaching History
By Milagros C. Guerrero

125 The Teaching of History and Other Social Sciences
By Gregorio C. Borlaza

140 Interdisciplinary Approach in the Study and Teaching of History
By R. J. de los Santos

148 Re-Examining Approaches, Methods and Techniques of Teaching in the Social Sciences
By Diosdado G. Capino

THE WRITING OF HISTORY

162 The Rewriting of Philippine History
By Gregorio F. Zaide

178 On the Rewriting of Philippine History
By Teodoro A. Agoncillo

188 The Writing of History
By Pedro A. Gagelonia

213 Objectivity and Impartiality in History
By Teodoro A. Agoncillo

218 Objectivity in Writing and Teaching History
By Filipinas E. Pineda

225 Interpretation in History
By Teodoro A. Agoncillo

234 Imagination in History
By Teodoro A. Agoncillo

246 Philippine Historiography as a Tool for Understanding
By Gabriel F. Fabella

MORE ON HISTORY

256 New Dimensions for Historical Studies
By Celedonio O. Resurreccion

271 The Relevance of the Past
By Celedonio O. Resurreccion

292 History as Social Science
By Samson A. Lucero

306 Relation of History to Other Disciplines
By Concesa Milan-Baduel

317 Myth, Ideology and History
By Jules de Raedt

332 Philosophy of History
By James D. Skerry

337 Philippine Local History: a Bibliographical Survey
By Marcelino A. Foronda

DOCUMENT

353 The Ford Report on the Situation in the Philippines

Articles in the HISTORICAL BULLETIN do not represent the views of the PHA. Although the editors are responsible for their selection and acceptance, responsibility for the opinions expressed in the articles and for the accuracy of statements contained in them rests with their authors.

Articles for the BULLETIN should be sent to Mauro Garcia, Managing Editor, c/o Jorge B. Vargas Filipiniana Foundation, P.O. Box 1001, Manila.

Subscriptions and other business correspondence should be addressed to the Executive Secretary, Philippine Historical Association, R-409, Guido-Ver Bldg., M. Jhocson cor. España, Manila.

The BULLETIN is published quarterly in March, June, September and December.

Subscriptions are ₱10.00 a year in the Philippines; elsewhere, $5.00. Single copies are ₱3.00 and $1.25.

Copyright 1973 by the Philippine Historical Association.

President Ferdinand E. Marcos delivering his speech at the Annual Convention of the Philippine Historical Association at the Maharlika Hall, Malacañang, on November 28, 1972.

Towards a New Social Order: The Rationale of Martial Law in the Philippines*

Ferdinand E. Marcos

DEAN Gloria Santos, Mr. Master of Ceremonies, Professor Revilla, illustrious founders of this historical association. We seem to have a small reunion today, for many of you seated before me are not really strangers in my midst. Jorge Revilla was my contemporary in the University of the Philippines. Some of the founders of this association who have just been introduced were in fact my professors in the university. When we were there, of course, we sat down, maintained an almost reverent silence, and listened to them. It is then quite exulting to stand here before you and have my former professors sit tight, remain silent, and listen—for a change. That, my friends, is one of the fringe benefits of the presidency.

But a greater pleasure lies in seeing the perspectives ushered in by historical studies. Today, we are coursing through a significant period in our history and I surmise that many of you will take the pleasure of having your work done on the assessment or the objective recounting of events now occurring in print. And yet, what is it that they used to say about history? That it has an intriguing penchant for oscillation and there is actually nothing new in this world, for events have a tendency to repeat themselves.

---

* Speech delivered at the Annual Convention of the Philippine Historical Association at the Maharlika Hall, Malacañang, on November 28, 1972.

Thus, perhaps, if we were to mark out precisely the demarcation line between the history maker and the history writer, we might find the task impossible. For the history maker is in all probability also a scholar and a writer of history and his actions in all probability drawn from history.

And thus it is that many people often ask me: Where did you get this concept of martial law, Philippine style? Dean Santos raised this question when she came into my study just now. And with this question in mind, I welcome your theme. The theme of your annual seminar is: Towards a New Social Order. I have just stressed, however, a well-known historical fact that there is no such thing as a new social order, that in fact there is nothing new in this world. The "new" social order concept, social justice, equity, elimination of the inequities of society, the movement towards the recognition of equal rights among men—these are not new. They go all the way back to the beginning of the human consciousness.

Two million five hundred thousand years ago, primitive man, according to the latest discovery of Leakey in Africa, had a brain about half the size that of contemporary man. But even then this particular stage of development indicated the capabilities of the human mind. Man has always been a unique creature, distinguished from the other creatures of the world by his ability to change his environment.

If there is anything which man can be proud of, it is that environment does not control him; rather, he controls his environment. And so nowadays, we are all obssessed with ecology, for we have caused the degeneracy of our environment instead of improving it. Modern man finds this one of his principal obstacles to the attainment of perfection. But then I am beginning to talk like a historian — and I am only an honorary president.

However, I place this in proper perspective as a prelude to what I have to unburden myself of, because logic should be based upon premises of reality — factual, accepted premises. If this be so, more than anybody else, the leader of any group of men, of any nation, or of any people, must move upon facts and premises long established by history. Therefore his conclusions which serve as his guides must be those arising out of history.

Your interest and mine, therefore, are co-equal. They parallel each other, for as you are interested in the writing of history for history's sake, I, too, am interested in history not only for the wisdom and the book learning that it conveys, but also for its value as a basis for actual decision, policy-making and implementation.

Thus, when I declared the emancipation of the farmer through Decree No. 27 on October 21st, what was in my mind? My mind was on the critical point and period of development of the nation and that is, that the nation does not develop until after the great majority of those who have rightful claims are fulfilled and their valid grievances redressed.

No society moves forward unless a people who are filled with the rightfulness of grievance, who are motivated and moved by a keen realization of the existence of injustice and inequity, can devote themselves to something else other than the redress of that grievance. Therefore, if we are to motivate our people into progress, we must first remove this obstacle. This is as clear to a historian and to a writer, to a thinker and to a scholar as the sun rises every morning. Yet all too often, we give way to human weaknesses and we commit mistakes which in the logic of events no historian should commit.

And so, today, as we speak of a new social order, it is perhaps necessary that we not only attempt to change the new social order but also place such a change in its proper perspective so that you, the historians, may understand and realize exactly what the purpose is, what brought it about and what we expect from it.

Let me take you back to another seminar in 1967 when I appeared before you. This was the day, or rather, this was the year 1967 when we were just beginning to move forward in the matter of rationalizing the application of resources, the limited resources of the country moving into what we then considered the priority projects which would move our people. We discovered then through continued application and study, and by the unanimous recommendation of all the experts, the men and women, both foreign and local talents, who have made it a habit to study the human organizations, we call social scientists, political scientists, historians and other experts. But it was agreed then that the things that determine the movement and progress of peoples are simple. They are, in accordance with Toynbee's theory of environmental challenge, the things that change the environment. So we came up with the rice program.

We noted the deficiencies in transportation and communication. So we came up with the road program. The rice program actually does not merely mean rice. It means such varied things as irrigation. It means such things as multi-purpose irrigation, hydro-electric dams like Angat, Biñga, Ambuklao, Maria Cristina, the thermal plant in Bataan, Caliraya improvement and the like. Now, we are trying to develop the Bicol region by putting up a geothermal plant. We are trying to harness the heat energy that comes from within the bowels of the earth.

Again, I repeat, these are the ramifications of the 1966 and 1967 program. And so, you had the rice program which meant a variety of activities. Then, you had the road program. If you remember, we could not finish any road that we had started. We still had what our forebears during the Revolution like Rizal and Mabini referred to as the temperament of *niñgas kugon*. We enthusiastically start out on a project and in a few days we forget all about it. We lose our enthusiasm. We forget our dedicated pledges. And so every day we have to stand up before the flag and pledge our allegiance to it. That ceremony is an acceptance of weakness in a way, because we have to be reminded about our duties. And yet it also accepts the reality of human nature, because it is but human to forget what is difficult, what is laborious, what is painful. This is the system of selection or elimination. The historians know all about the technique of selection. You do not falsify history, you just select what to talk about and write about.

They are all true, but selection has a way of distorting images. But I will not go into that. I remember Winston Churchill saying, "If they won't write history the way it should be written after making history, I will write history," which he did. Not that I am intending to do that, but it is sometimes convenient to be able to write down your own side of history. Of course, there are some parts in the books written by Winston Churchill which, though not distorted, are selective. That is the proper term for it, is it not?

But I go back to the perspectives that we have. In 1967, you had the rice program, you had the road program, and in the road program again you had other allied programs to it. You had the program, first of all, of setting up new techniques of employment for our people. You had to choose between the use of mechanization which would dislodge manual labor and actual use of labor. We decided on a compromise. Many of us never realized the difficulties of this, but consider that in 1965, when I came into the presidency, we had a 10 percent unemployment ratio. Ten percent of a ten million labor population, meant that about one million were unemployed, and it was our intention to bring this down. How can you bring it down if you start going into mechanization? How can you bring it down if you start bringing in all the reparations equipment that I brought in? I brought in all kinds of equipment — cementing equipment. We had a cementing equipment which could lay down a cement road about five meters wide on each side at the rate of one-half to one kilometer a day. But using that meant thousands of laborers being dislodged all over the Philippines.

At the same time, we tried out the engineer construction battalions of the military instead of teaching them merely how to kill and get killed. We decided that they should learn not only to destroy, but also to construct. And so, we were among the first in Asia to put up what we referred to as the engineer construction battalions. The Americans were surprised when in 1966 on a state visit, I spoke to the President of the United

States and said: We have come to ask you not guns but road-building equipment. They thought that we were going to ask for cannons, artillery, tanks or destroyers. I said I was organizing 10 engineer construction battalions to work where the ordinary laborers could not work because there are areas even now where the ordinary citizen does not wish to go because his family may not find it convenient or there actually is no income. It is a missionary zeal that drives a man to go into such areas. Up to now there is no doctor in Palanan, Isabela. There is none. You have to start ordering people to go there because it is malaria-infested. You cannot rear a family if you are there and it reeks with all forms of violence. It was, anyway, until martial law.

So you had this program. Then, you had the school program, and what was the school program? Was it merely the matter of building schools? No. It was an educational program. First, there was a study of how the educational system relates to our economic development and we found out that the incidence of unemployment among the intelligent class — meaning those who were graduating from school — was going higher and higher every year.

And yet, the intelligent class constituted a restless class. Again, we go back to history and we find out that most revolutions are started by the graduates of schools. You look at those who are unemployed. You look at every revolution — the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, the Chinese Revolution. Mao Tse-tung was unemployed because Chiang Kai-shek took over his job. That is true. It is a simplistic way of saying it, but this was one of the reasons why we moved into this question of education. I organized the Presidential Educational Survey Commission which came up with these recommendations, and we must now reform our educational system in accordance with the experiences that we went through in the past several years.

Anyway, in 1967 I spoke before you and the subject was: "Philippine Politics — Prospects and Retrospect." Even historians were interested in politics those days. I delivered an extemporaneous speech because I had just come from the provinces, but your secretariat took down the message verbatim and reported it in your *Historical Bulletin*, December 1967.[*] Some of these things can now be viewed historically and let me read some of the paragraphs of this message. I quote:

> We are in a period of development not only of this nation, not only of Asia, but of all the world, a time which is epochal. It is most historic. The old concepts are being swept away, and passing through the face of the world is a fresh new breeze, indeed a new wind moves across the face of the globe. You go all over Asia and you see leaders who are mostly young with new ideas, new solutions, the old and the ancient problems. Our own new society is evolving and it needs perhaps the practiced, the skilled eye of the historian to denote, and mark out, where such evolution moves and where it shall carry us.
>
> The Philippine Historical Association is one of the most active, and valuable partners of government in the task of achieving the national goal of economic and social progress. By means of seminars like this, where the inquiring mind is afforded an opportunity to examine important aspects of national life, you add to the momentum of progress created by the forces of government and society acting in concert to fulfill a program of government.
>
> But it is a constant day-to-day activity of your every member, in relentless pursuit of the truth, that provides us in government a larger measure of assistance. The findings of historical research and the accomplishments of scholarship enable our people and our government to develop new perspectives, to change ourselves, and to view ourselves with that objectivity that is the hallmark of the historian's life.

Now I see that you have tried honestly and assiduously to fulfill this task and to view ourselves with the objectivity, the dispassionate, scholarly perspective of a true scholar. I have watched with great interest the various publications of relevant documents in your bulletins to serve as basis for evaluating some of our plans. We have utilized the bulletins as source material in many instances, and you have kept alive in our hearts some of the travails and sacrifices that we had experienced as a nation by publishing various documents of our guerrila days.

When I was reading the account of Aguinaldo's experience on the famous trek from the Sierra Madre and the Cordilleras toward Palanan, I was taken aback at the parallelism between the experience of Aguinaldo and his grandsons of the 1940s. Aguinaldo in 1898, 1899 up to 1900, of course, quarrelling with another great patriot, Gen. Antonio Luna, who insisted that after the battle of Caloocan they break up into guerrilla bands and not limit themselves to conventional warfare, the line system and holding ground. Antonio Luna had had military experience as well as training in Europe, you see, and he realized that they were outfought and they were outmaneuvered and that the enemy was quite superior not only in numbers, arms and equipment, but also in strategy. He realized that in order to survive they had to break up into small guerrilla groups and immediately shift into what modern writers refer to as unconventional warfare, which is actually nothing but guerrilla warfare — something which you and I started way back a long, long time ago, a kind of warfare which our forebears were proficient.

---

[*] Vol. XI, No. 4, p. 347.—Ed.

But Aguinaldo, realizing that he had to maintain the cohesion and the unity of his command in order that he could maintain the semblance of a Republic and of a government, insisted upon conventional warfare and thus, they were "destroyed in detail," as the military would put it. They were destroyed in successive battles until they were forced to the mountains. "Destroyed in detail" merely means being destroyed not by one single great battle but by a process of gradual attrition. They suffered so many casualties that they were slowly reduced to bands, so much so that when Gregorio del Pilar fought in Tirad Pass he had barely a few. He had only about 27 men, and was the only one on horseback. It was said that he was the last man to fall. In short, Aguinaldo's experiences were recounted and I read them.

To go into what I call interesting reading, is my kind of luxury. It is my way of resting and I browse through all the books that are in my library. That was how I came across this bulletin of yours. I was taken aback that the same names cropped up, the first names that I had personally known, the same camps, the same trails that we had followed when we were in the underground, when we fought in Mt. Province, Baguio,

Ambeth Ocampo

Kalinga, Loo Valley all the way down to the place where Yamashita, as you know, surrendered to us in Loo Valley after the fight in Bessang Pass and the fight in Lepanto, Cervantes, and the like. My grandfather, who had been with Gen. Antonio Luna, had recounted to me the same things, and I was surprised that these memoirs bespoke of the same strategy, the same weaknesses and the same petty quarrels that existed between the leaders. These quarrels also existed among the guerrillas. It is surprising, nay, uncanny, how the occurrences seemed to repeat themselves. Remember — you were old enough to have been conscious of the events at the time — that one of the reasons the guerrillas could never get together was that everybody wanted to become a general.

Well, the same thing divided the *revolucionarios* under Aguinaldo. Everybody including those who did not know how to fire a gun wanted to be a general. I was the only one who was not a general. While I was issuing commands to generals, I only had a major's oak leaf. Although I was supposed to be a full colonel, I refused to put on an eagle, because this had not been confirmed by the senior authorities. There was no headquarters of the Philippine Army, for one thing, and since the Americans were not here I could not accept the promotions coming from the Americans—one of the queer facts of our history which I suppose somebody would write about. When we were fighting in the underground I contended legitimately that our forces were irregular forces. They were not recovered nor under the control of any armed force, whether that of the United States or of the Philippines and that, therefore, my rank in Bataan was the rank that was last recognized, and since I was promoted this was another funny thing in our history about fighting in Bataan.

Here we were fighting. It was the last day. We knew there were moves for a surrender and we were fighting for our lives. We were fighting for our survival. Then came a courier, and I thought he was bringing ammunition with him because I had asked for armor-piercing ammunition. What did he bring with him? A message. He had just been promoted to captain as if it was of any importance at that time.

But, anyway, there it was. I am glad that you have gone into all these exercises in putting into print the memoirs of the Revolution, of Aguinaldo and his colleagues. I am very happy indeed that you are documenting everything and it is my hope that you will also document these events that are occurring now, for you show to us the strengths, the weaknesses, the deficiencies not only of our people but of individual leaders and, by publishing them from time to time, you remind us that there is no man who can claim infallibility. One of the traits of greatness is the recognition of such a fact, that one must be certain — one must have confidence — because one cannot be a leader if one is not confident. If one is not proud of his own achievements, he cannot lead other men because other men will not follow him.

One of the rules not only in war but also in peace is that to your men you should never show hesitancy and you must always be sure of yourself. But even if within yourself you know that there is a grave doubt which prompts you to question your own decision, you must never demonstrate it to the people. You must, however, realize that you are human, that you are not infallible and, therefore, you must listen to all the pieces of advice that may come from any side. Without even sometimes going through the motions of recognizing that advice, you listen to advice. And as a human being I learned from this historical reality.

Anyway, the personality of our people has been drawn by you in very graphic lines in your publications. One such document, for instance, is exemplified in the last letter written by Miguel Lopez de Legazpi to the Viceroy of New Spain, dated August 11, 1572, which you published in Volume XIV, March-June 1970 issue.* The various seminars that you held from time to time, especially that one on "Discipline for National Survival," was prognostication, a projection of today. "Discipline for national survival" which now has become partly the motto of today's new social order was referred to by you as early as March-June 1970. In all probability they will respect later on in days to come that the Philippine Historical Association and Marcos participated in the studies of martial law.

---

* *Historical Bulletin,* Vol. XIV, p. 181-194.—Ed.

But this helps us to correct the ills of our people and our society. And today, more than in any other period in the recent past, we are witnesses to history in the making. These are exciting times indeed. They are eventful, explosive, creative. We destroy just as we create, but it is sometimes harder to repair than to build a new construction, a new structure. And this is our role. It is said that one of the heaviest burdens of a President is to correct and rectify the errors of his predecessors. I would not put it that way. Instead I would say that it is the heavy burden of a President to recognize the errors of the past committed by whoever he may have been—whether committed by him or by others, by his own predecessors, he must try somehow to ingenuously (because he may lack the resources and the time) wipe these out. The faster he does it, the better, because it is not to the advantage of the people that while he is trying to move forward, he is equivocating as to how to destroy what is wrong. First of all, the thing to do is to admit that it is wrong and then wipe it out from the basis of action.

As we move into these events, one question may be asked. What is the point of departure? What is the starting point? When did we turn a corner in our historical march toward our objectives, our dreams, our ideals? There are many who will point to the fact that the establishment by the Filipinos of the first Republic in Asia and in Africa was a historical fact and we point that out. And then in contemporary history, when was the turning point? There are many who have said the turning point was my proclamation, Proclamation 1081. But why did it take me such a long time to take such a decisive step? And when I proclaimed martial law, and the people noticed that it was a peaceful kind of revolution, everybody sighed with relief — including those who were engaged in violence, because now they could return to their old habits, and many volunteered to surrender firearms. Then came the question: "Why did you, Mr. President, not proclaim martial law earlier than September 21st? If this is what happens under martial law and there is a basis and foundation for civic order in our society, why did you not start this earlier?"

Well, the truth of the matter is that the decisions of even the most powerful President depend upon the logic of events. When you proclaim martial law there must be a legitimate constitutional basis because we must admit that martial law is a form of constitutional authoritarianism. I studied this particular aspect when I was still in the College of Law in the University of the Philippines, not realizing that someday I would use this knowledge to run the country. This is quite amusing. I was telling our historians that when I was in the College of Law in the University of the Philippines, I wrote a paper. I was the editor of the *Philippine Law Journal*, and we had to rush a paper on something novel, and I picked the subject of constitutional dictatorship. This was the year 1937, I believe, or 1938. I graduated in 1939. I am not that old, but it has been quite sometime. I wrote a paper on constitutional dictatorship which went all the way back to the Roman Republic.

If you will remember, the Roman Empire was antedated by a Roman Republic, and before that by a Roman kingdom. The second phase of development of Rome was as a Republic, and when the Romans instituted this Republic immediately after driving away the kings, they included in their fundamental law a mechanism known as the dictatorship to meet any emergency arising out of invasion. From this device arose what we now refer to as the Law of the Siege or Internal Strife, from which arose what we now call the Law on Civil War, and they included in that fundamental law a provision to the effect that in the event of invasion or rebellion or civil strife within the Republic, one man would be called upon to take over all powers of the government. Rousseau, the well-known writer, stated in his study of all democracies that every democracy which did not have a mechanism of emergency powers in time of civil war or invasion, perished, and those that had this particular flexibility and accommodation in their fundamental law or in the concept by their leaders of government survived. Thus, the Roman Republic survived, and the empire after it.

This is not to say that even then I was thinking of dictatorship. No. I was making a historical study of the concepts of democracy. I also looked into the American and the British precedents. The British, if you will remember, practically compelled their king to accept certain rights as existing not among the people but among the nobility. You will notice that the first revolution in England did not start from the lower classes. It started from the nobility, the barons, and these were the warlords, the men with the "private armies" at the time. Yes, that was how it started, how freedom was evolved.

But, anyway, England had this accommodation and this facility, and so did France. Of course, Germany had another kind of experience. Article 48 of the Weimar Constitution provided for the exercise of emergency powers by the President. But it happened that the President was weak, so somebody by the name of Hitler took over. That is why the President should always be strong and must never give way.

In short, he must never give way to the military nor to the politicians. This is one of the lessons that history teaches us. Where the people have bestowed power, the man who receives such power must rise up to the challenge and must never give way to the importunes of the men around him. This is quite obvious.

You will be interested to know that when I made these studies in 1970 and discovered, for instance, that there were both a rightist and a leftist revolution developing in the Philippines, I reminisced my college days and I looked up to my work on constitutional dictatorship, although at the time I called it constitutional authoritarianism. Even then I avoided the term dictatorship. I have an aversion to such a statement, and you notice that every time I make a decision I don't just count on myself. I consult everybody, including those whom I do not like. It is strange, but it is worth that you listen to the worst as well as to the best, is not it? When you make a serious decision, if you are to survive you must accept what is both painful and pleasant. You cannot just listen to the sycophants around you who will mislead you anyway; that is why they are sycophants.

But the best advisers, so the wisemen say, are not the ones who are around you and who are alive, but those who are long dead and who had been able to view events with the ob-

Ambeth Ocampo

jectivity of uninterested scholars, and if this is true then the best advisers are still the historians. The best adviser is still the writer, not the writer who has an ax to grind, like some of the media men I know, but the writer who puts down without selection — I insist, without selection — everything that has occurred and determines that he shall not make too many conclusions but will allow the reader to make his.

Well, I am not telling any story, like an O. Henry, or a Guy de Maupassant, or anything that is dramatic up to the end, but I am making a clinically objective presentation of facts.

And today, you and I go back to all these occurrences and, someday, say, 10 or 20 years from now, you and I will be laughing about what has happened here, about the puny efforts of both the rightist and the leftist rebels, about how the rightists attempted to ride on the leftist revolution by providing it funds to start all kinds of violent demonstrations, hoping like Lenin to take over the leadership of the revolution when it succeeded. You know history. Leaders that had established new societies in the past did not actually lead the revolution. They took over the leadership of the revolution after the violence was over. Lenin took over from Kerensky, if you remember. Lenin was the dialogue, he was the thinker, but the men who led the revolution was not even Kerensky, but the men before him.

Well, in our case, who was the leader of the revolution? Who started the revolution? Bonifacio. Somebody else took over the leadership. I was listening to my grandfather sometime ago. He was, as I told you, with Luna, and we come from Batac, Ilocos Norte, as you probably know. Ricarte was also from that place and he used to tell my grandfather that it was surprising how things had changed the history of the country. Ricarte, who was known as Vibora, was one of the great leaders of the revolution, but he was an artillery man. He was actually a Spanish officer, rather an officer in the Spanish army, and they were fighting Aguinaldo in Kawit, Cavite, and in the fight he saw Filipinos suffering casualties and his heart quavered within him, and he said, "My God, I am fighting my own kind. I am fighting my own race." And so he talked to his soldiers and they turned around the artillery guns, and they started firing at the Spaniards who were their commanding officers, and that made history because from then on, because of the artillery of Vibora and the rest of those who followed his example, Aguinaldo started winning the battles in Cavite, while Bonifacio lost all the battles that he had fought. Because of this, in the succeeding convention in Tejeros and later on even in the meetings of the leaders, Bonifacio lost the leadership, and Aguinaldo took over. Bonifacio started the revolution. Aguinaldo took over until he surrendered in Palanan, or rather until he was betrayed, in Palanan.

But these are all interesting matters which point to one fact, that if you are going to be a leader in a revolution, you have to be consistent but flexible. The occurrences in the Philippines in the past several years indicate that there have been several forces here in our country. These forces are:

First, the rightist group that desire to maintain the status quo and yet encourage a leftist revolution. The evidence is coming out now in the interrogation of all those people who thought that they could overcome my *anting-anting*. Yes, I am told now that these people wanted to shoot me down while playing golf, or blow me up with a bomb, pursuant to some harebrained plan to eliminate me and for them to take over a revolutionary junta. This was the rightist attempt. It started all the way back in 1969, I understand, after the elections. But here you can see the strange partnership between the rightist and the leftist element because to some people, if you read 1081, the impression is that what we have is nothing but a secessionist movement in Mindanao where 500,000 were injured, displaced or rendered homeless and 2,000 killed. Second, a leftist movement of the Mao Tse-tung variety, the Chinese-oriented one with the traditionalist communist not in alliance but standing by the sidelines.

It looks as though this is the picture. But, this is not the complete picture, and this is one of the things I wanted to clarify to you because you will be writing about this. The true picture is that the rebellion came from all sides. It was a rebellion from the left and also from the right. The rightist rebellion was composed of political figures, warlords and some military retirees dreaming that they were still young and could do some fighting. They wanted to become a secretary of national defense, a chief of staff or perhaps a president. Looking at the histories of Central and Southern America as well as at the past revolutions, we discovered that this has always been true — that whenever there is a revolution, there are groups along the sidelines goading the rebels but preparing to take over the leadership once the revolution succeeded.

This is true and we should have been forwarned. I was forwarned. I immediately noticed the existence of a rightist group that was planning to take over the leadership of the revolution once the Maoists succeeded. The traditionalist communists were also staying along the sidelines, trying to maintain liaison with the Maoists, but also planning to take over the leadership of the revolution. This was one group.

So you have the rightist group. Someday their names will be revealed, very soon I suppose. I have told the military to go right ahead and continue the investigations. This was a rightist group that is well funded. Oh, they have plenty of money because many of them are rich. I do not know what they are thinking of, despite their wealth. Anyway, they do not seem to know what to do with their money. I suppose that they wanted the status quo, a society of privilege, a society of exemption, a society of power over the great number of people, dominating the weak and the oppressed, and they are reactionaries as the leftists call them. I also call them reactionaries.

But, anyway, there was this group. Then, there were the moderates. This leaderless group did not know quite clearly where they were exactly and where they belonged. The moderates were helpless because they did not have any ideology. Among the moderates for a time were the Socialist Party of the Philippines and the Christian Socialist Party also. These are the moderates. They did not want to have anything to do with violence although occasionally they were inveigled by, and supported some kind of violent activities provided that it would shock the people into demanding reforms. This is something which I also thought was good, because it would reform the government and I could tell the people, the men who were working. If you do not help me out now, if you do not change your ways, there would be a revolution in which you are going to lose your head. But they did not do quite that much, did they?

Anyway, these were the groups. In Mindanao you had the secessionists who taught that from the trouble and the agitation there would arise an occasion where the national government would be so weak that they would be able to organize a new country, Bangladesh style.

But here you can see that the principal agent was still the group with the military power. When you have such a situation, the civil government becomes helpless because the rightists are also trying to harness the support of everybody who believes in the old society — everybody who believes in special privilege, the politicians and the rich people.

The communist ideology is a simplistic ideology. It pits one class against the other and, therefore, is quite open to understanding, whereas even socialism itself or ownership by the state of capital goods is not too easily understood. But communism sets the fight between divergent groups, between black and white and, therefore, is easily understood by the young. It is also idealistic in a sense, because it attempts to change the present order together with its inequities and, therefore, is acceptable to the young. This is the reason why moderates often tend to gravitate towards this kind of ideology.

Thus, you saw this interplay of forces. While the government was busy fighting the people in Mindanao, it also had to fight the armed groups like the gangsters, the criminal syndicates. In Manila, how many kidnappings occurred without being reported to the government? Every day. *Wika nga nila ay parang Quiapo raw.* The kidnapped persons were so many that they alternated every minute. *Nagpapalitan doon sa hideout iyong ating mga nilalabanan,* the kidnappers. And in addition to this, there are the organized groups, people like the loggers, miners, cattle barons everywhere, not only in Mindanao. Can you believe it? Even in Bataan there is a parcel of land 1,000 hectares in area that has been leased out as a cattle pasture . . . (END OF TAPE I)

I am a gun collector not because I like guns but because we are studying what gun will fit the Asian soldier or the Filipino soldier. Those guns prepared by the Westerners fit their men because they are big, but you and I know, for instance, that the small caliber guns, the .223 or the armalite, is not accurate in jungle fighting. It is the high-caliber gun, the NATO gun, the 7.62 that is accurate. And this is the reason for my interest in weapons because ultimately we shall have to make our own guns, assault rifles, submachine guns, mortars, and the like. That is my only reason for being interested in guns. But at any rate, I was surprised at the types of guns that we saw in Antipolo, Teresa, and everywhere else. Well, you know more or less what has happened to some people there. They were caught concealing guns and ammunition in cement. Can you imagine that? This was pretty close to Manila, and that should answer the question: "Why did you wait until 1972 to proclaim martial law?"

It was our hope that we could avoid the use of extraordinary powers as much as possible because one does not know what will happen in the event of the proclamation of martial law. No matter how good your intentions are, martial law is martial law. It means the power of the gun. It means the power of coercion by the military. It means arrest, it means compulsion, it means intimidation. Yes, we were going to utilize peaceful compulsion by the show of force, without bloodshed, and that is why I wanted this operation neat and clean. I wanted the immediate apprehension of those who may become the rallying point of violent counteraction so that there would be no bloodshed, and I did not want anybody shot unless it was cleared by myself.

So this followed, but who could anticipate what could happen? Suppose there was a big body of men who suddenly took counteraction against the military. Then the military would have had to bring out all the armed men they had been holding in reserve, and this was what I wanted to avoid. So habeas corpus was first suspended. Before that we applied the first power. Under Article 7, Section 10, Sub-Paragraph 2 of our Constitution, you have three powers of the President. The first power is to call out the troops, to quell the disorder and the rebellion. The second power is to suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, and the third is martial law. If you are a good doctor, you must first prescribe the least toxic medicine. Now, what is the least toxic medicine? Call out the troops, and that is what I did. It did not work, so I tried the next medicine; the next medicine is to suspend the writ of the privilege of habeas corpus. It is less toxic. Again it did not perform its task, because when it was reinstated, we discovered that the rebels' numbers had increased. And they were becoming more arrogant. So I went back to the last.

But when you adopt the last, you already decide that it is all or nothing; meaning, you either go whole hog, you put everything at stake, you gamble your life, you gamble the lives of your family, you gamble the state of the nation, you gamble the future of the nation.

And this is the reason for the hesitancy. No man in his proper senses will proclaim martial law at the drop of a hat. You must consider this with the most deliberate of preparations. The truth of the matter is we had been studying this repeatedly and I refused. I did not want to proclaim martial law. It was recommended as far back as 1970 but then I said no, we shall not proclaim martial law. Now one historical question will be asked: "When did you actually sign the proclamation of martial law?" There are many who say, the proclamation was made on the 23rd of September. If by proclamation is meant my appearing on television and saying that martial law is enforced, it was on September 23. But when did I sign the proclamation on martial law? I actually signed it on September 17. But it was held and it was suspended and I kept it in my possession. I kept it in my possession, because on September 17 I wanted to be sure that the things that I wanted to know were definitely confirmed.

I wanted to find out if it was true that there was a rightist attempt at a coup d'etat. I wanted to know the personalities involved. I wanted evidence not just an intelligence report. What I wanted was a sworn statement by the supposed penetration agent who claimed that he had been present during the conspiracy; that there was going to be an attempt to grab the government from me, by first eliminating me and, if I was not eliminated, kidnapping my children and others close to me. At the same time I wanted to know who were involved in the conspiracy. I wanted to know whether responsible people in the government and the military, and whether politicians were involved. The moment I knew that we were facing not only the Muslims in the south, not only the Maoists and the traditionalists but also a rightist revolution — on that day that this was confirmed in writing to me, I signed the proclamation of martial law.

This is the first time I reveal this because I believe that the Philippine Historical Association is entitled to this particular fact of history.

I signed two copies, only two copies, of this proclamation. One copy was supposed to be signed on September 21; actually it was signed on September 17, but it is dated September 21. I wanted a period within which I could commune with myself and with God and ask him whether it was correct for me to proclaim martial law. I asked for a sign. He gave me several signs. I told myself, if this occurs, I will immediately order martial law to be enforced. And it occurred. It did not only occur; it seems that I was being led and guided by some strange greater mind above me, and I felt it and knew it. And, therefore, even before the ambuscade on Secretary Ponce Enrile, I had already ordered the enforcement of the proclamation. There are some who will say that because of the sequence of events, the enforcement of the proclamation must have been due to the ambuscade of Secretary Ponce Enrile. It is not true. That is not true. It is very far from the truth. Long before that, I had decided to proclaim martial law.

It is not also true that it was my decision alone. I was not alone in making the decision. There were several men with me and they are responsible men. I consulted my people, some of whose names I will reveal later on because they are still alive and in position. You will be surprised who agreed with me. The most conservative and the most deliberate leaders in the various branches of the government participated in this decision-making.

And now I cannot say anything more than to prognosticate about the future. What is going to happen next? I could not say anything yesterday. I called the leaders, and I asked them the same question. What is going to happen next? What are we going to do now? Well, I told them, we had two objectives under martial law. The first objective was to eradicate the armed force that constituted the rebellion. We are in the process of eradicating the armed force of the left but the right may still exist. There are some people who have asked me the question: "Have you succeeded in maintaining peace and order? And my answer is always conditional, yes and no, because there are still some people who continue to think in terms of a rightist revolution. I know this. I realized how tenuous our hold is. The moment I am gone, the moment anything happens to me, I am afraid of what may happen to our country, because then forces that would vie for leadership of the new revolution would be left free.

I am not talking about the military, because the military will peform what it considers its constitutional task. It will not allow an illegal grab for power and I am not talking about the leftists nor the rightists alone. I am talking of the various groups that still dream in terms of running this country no matter how. I have used the term "tenuous" deliberately, because as I say there is always a calm before the storm. And if history again teaches us that revolutions come in several ways, they do not come in one single way. After the first wave has been stopped, there is always an attempt at re-organization, and it may come from a different point. This is why I am very hesitant in making assurances about supposed peace and order all over the country. Yes, we have pulled out their teeth, it is quite true, but they may soon be using a revolver instead of their teeth. So we must watch out and that is the reason for my hope that everybody will participate in the attainment of the second objective.

What is the second objective? The second objective is much more important from my point of view, and it is to eradicate the social roots of this rebellion. For no matter what anybody says, there are valid grievances for rebellion in a developing society. In every developing society, there is a valid reason for rebellion when the ruling class, the rich people and the political leadership, are insensitive to the feelings of the poor, the weak and the oppressed. This is true, not only in the past; it will always be true. It is true now, and it will continue to be true.

This is the reason that compels us to create a new society. Your theme is the new social order. The reason for the new social order is not that it is something which is inherently correct and just. There are things that are inherently just, that do not need any logical reason to explain. But unless we change the social order, unless we remove the causes of inequity, unless we give every man an equal opportunity from birth until death, unless the government establishes a social and civic order that will mean dignity for every individual, then there is no justification for a strong military, for a strong leader. It matters little how many arms we can take from the citizenry. There will always be an effort at a revolution and the revolution may yet succeed because the guerrillas can thrive upon the support of discontented people.

The structure of government is based on the people, and it cannot live without the support of the people. The same is true of regular forces. It is not only true of guerrillas. You have heard of this, I am sure. Mao Tse-tung said it in a different way. He said the fish swim in the waters, and the fish are the guerrillas and the waters are the common people. But regular forces, unless they are overwhelmingly dominant and strong like the conquering forces of Ghengis Khan or of Napoleon and even of Alexander, cannot survive unless they are supported by the people. This is as axiomatic as any principle of law and of war.

Therefore, it is necessary that we move not into the realm of combat or war in which most of us are sick and tired, but into the realm of social action. We must alter the government, its organization, and thus you have these basic projects that we have now and I will count them off to you as fast as I can. These are: The first, we refer to as peace and order. Actually it means everything that allows justice; it is not limited to peace and order that merely means that private armies cannot now be allowed to thrive, that the warlords must learn to comply with the law. It means that the judges who used to be bought and corrupted are to be removed, the prosecutors who allowed themselves to be dominated by the oligarchs, have no place in a set-up like this. So peace and order is our first concern.

The second concern is social justice and land reform, and land reform means scientific agriculture as well as a grant of ownership of land to the small farmer. The tiller of the soil must own the same. And this also involves not only scientific farming but cooperatives. The government must organize our poor people so that they will have the strength of the rich and of the mighty.

Then you must have economic development, which is related to the regulation of prices. The prices of commodities are what people are most concerned about. Actually, prices are the result of economic development. When your production of rice is low, your prices will go up. It is the law of supply and demand. You cannot alter it. And what therefore can we alter? As human beings with the capability of changing our environment, we must change production. We must increase it and this involves investment, this involves prices, this involves the artificial control of prices whenever the distribution is distorted. There may be plenty of rice in Cagayan Valley, for instance. The price there right now is ₱1.80, and yet there may be scarcity in some places where there is fighting, let us say in Mindanao. You must therefore control the price until you can bring in the rice from where there is a great supply. And this constitutes a program on prices, investment and production. Industrialization or economic development depends upon your exports because the dollar earnings or foreign exchange earnings of the country determine how fast you can introduce industrialization. This is the key factor. Exports. If your exports goes down, your rate of industrialization goes down. That is as clear as the balance weight. You must increase your exports and therefore you must increase your investments.

And then you go into government re-organization. Your principal weapon, or your capping head in your drive, for all of these reforms is the government. If the government itself is an example of the old society, then forget it, the whole movement fails. Therefore, you must reform our government.

Then we must look into labor, because labor constitutes a great majority of our people, whether it is agricultural or urban. The labor force is composed of about 11 million of our people, but they are the people who create. They are the productive units. They are not the idle and sterile units of our society and therefore they must be encouraged. For capital therefore to merely siphon off to itself all the profits and the income of industry and every economic activity is self-defeating. It will ultimately destroy capitalism and therefore we must protect labor.

Then we must go into education. This is the sixth. Education must be reformed in order that it shall relate to our aspirations as a people. We have produced too many lawyers, for one thing. I have often been asked what we should do about other products we can export, and my answer always is that we should export the lawyers in this country. That is not to say they are useless, because any person full of wisdom is always valuable. It is a valuable asset, but we must alter the orientation of education that there may be more productive units. I am not talking of technology alone. I am talking of production, anything that helps in the economic and social growth of the country.

So we finally have the seventh, social services — such things as housing, health and the other requirements for decent living. For instance, Manila has been converted for sometime into what we call a slum city, but so has Baguio, Cebu, Davao, Bacolod, and other centers of population you can think of. We require 480,000 houses every year and yet we produce and construct only 50,000 houses every year. So where will the rest of our population go? We have a growth rate of one of the highest in the world: 3.5 percent, some say. My guess is it is probably much closer to 4 than 3.5 percent. A lot of people do not talk about their children, but there are a lot of babies in this country. You know, we inject into the labor stream and to the labor pool 500,000 of these every year. And there are children that must be accommodated in our schools, numbering 500,000 every year. We require attention for all dental and health requirements.

We ask of our people discipline because while we are trying to utilize the resources that we have available, we must ask our people to take care of themselves in the meantime. It will take sometime to regulate the flow of needed investments and resources into these areas of priority. But in the meantime there are certain things which the people can take care of by themselves. For example, flood control. Here in Manila, I asked one question of the experts. Why is it that there are only some parts in Manila that are flooded and others are not? We checked the main drains of the sewage system. They were all clogged. With what? Garbage. Why? Because the garbage was not collected? Why? Because the people would not collect the garbage, and put it where trucks could get it. And for that matter, some of those garbage collectors were corrupt. Unless there was something under the table, they would not collect the garbage. You and I know this. We knew it from the beginning and all of us knew it. But would the citizen help? No. There was no discipline and where would you throw your garbage? When your neighbor is not looking, you throw it into his backyard. If you are not looking, your neighbor would throw his garbage into your backyard. And so on, until finally the drains were clogged.

Those drains were so clogged that we had to initiate a special project just to clean the sewage system of Manila, the city that was built four centuries ago, a city that claims to be civilized. And the health authorities had warned me that if we did not clean that up immediately, there would be an epidemic in Manila. Even if we buy all the medicine in the world, even if we inoculate everybody, there would be an epidemic here, unless something was done about cleaning the sewage system. No matter how scarce money was, we had to produce the money to clean it up.

And now after martial law, everybody goes out to deliver his garbage properly. Can you imagine the connection between martial law and garbage? Unbelievable, but true. This merely indicates that the breakdown of a society starts with the individual. It does not start with something big. It does not start with something dramatic, and climatic. It starts with something casual, ordinary and common play like garbage.

And so this is where the citizen comes in. And this is where the historians also come in. Because I repeat, no matter what others say, the written word is still a powerful instrument and the pen is still mightier than the sword. Words will always be able to achieve what the bullet cannot. And therefore my message to the historian is simple: write in order that we may attain this new social order; write about the traditions of our people, write about our past so that our people may learn to appreciate the past.

A people who do not appreciate their past have no future whatsover. A people not proud of themselves and who continue to denigrade their fellowmen, their traditions and their history are a people not entitled to be free. And a people who are proud of their achievements, those who can look back to their forebears and say they were great and noble men, are a people who can aspire to nobility and greatness. This then is the role of the historian, and as I look at you, I am confident that you will be a great and daring partner in this enterprise. Thank you very much.

Legal Background of Martial Law in the Philippines *

Juan Ponce Enrile

I FEEL DEEPLY HONORED that you have asked me, in my capacity as the Secretary of National Defense, to take up with you at this opening day of your annual seminar on history the implications and dimensions of the New Society,

I know that you are all closely studying the series of dramatic events that has been taking place in our country since the President proclaimed martial law on September 21st, and that you are watching with great anticipation foreseeable events in the near future.

As members of the Philippine Historical Association, you bear a special and keen interest in these events, because they most certainly constitute historic and decisive turns in Philippine history. Also as educators you assume the responsibility of determining the directions of these developments and sharing your knowledge with your students, the youth of the land. This is an important role and purpose and I therefore hope I shall succeed in helping you crystallize the historical and social implications of the new society. Final-

---

* Speech delivered in the Annual Seminar on History of the Philippine Historical Association at the Centro Escolar University, Manila, on Nov. 28, 1972.

ly, our knowledge may serve to motivate and guide us and the rest of our people in charting the future courses of action in this march toward a new social order.

In this adventure—I call it a noble adventure—it is important that we do not lose sight of the historical and legal background of the declaration of martial law in the country and how this has led to the conception of the New Society.

Martial law, in its general sense and meaning, is not our invention nor are we the first to apply martial law in the world. As a matter of fact, we are not the only country presently under martial law.

The concept of martial law can be traced back to a more ancient origin — to the *lex martialis* administered by a *curia militaris* in England during the Middle Ages, first exclusively applied among the military ranks but later expanded to include the civilian sector.

On its various applications at various times in world history, martial law has been regarded as descriptive of situations whenever the military took over certain or all functions deemed necessary to cope with arising emergencies and in these cases the institution of martial law carried with it the stigma of massive suppression and excessive use of violent means.

It is our first time in Philippine history to institute and implement martial law, and this national experience introduces a precedent because martial law Philippine style, sharply differs from all other experiences of martial law in the world. Our version of martial law is unique because its implementation is most lenient and liberal and its institution is derived from constitutional prerogatives of the President of the Republic.

When President Ferdinand E. Marcos proclaimed martial law all over the country two months and one week ago, he did so on the basis of a constitutional provision—Article VII, Section 10, paragraph (2), which provides that "the President shall be Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Philippines and, whenever it becomes necessary he may call out such Armed Forces to prevent or suppress lawless violence, invasion, insurrection, or rebellion. In case of invasion, insurrection, or rebellion or imminent danger thereof, when the public safety requires it, he may suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, or place the Philippines or any part thereof under martial law."

For our purposes, let me stress some salient points in this section of the Philippine Constitution.

First, this section in the Constitution created a dual personality in the position of the President, because he is both chief executive and commander-in-chief at the same time. At present, while he is exercising the functions of commander-in-chief at a higher degree, he does not cease to be the highest civilian leader of the land. At no time, in both the constitutional and practical sense, does the president cease to be at any time president or commander-in-chief.

Secondly, the proclamation of martial law is dictated *by necessity*. It is to be availed of when the stated conditions arise and when the public safety so requires it. Martial law is a law of necessity because it concerns the defense and preservation of the State itself in order to protect the public safety and welfare. At the same time, we should note that the actuality of invasion, insurrection or rebellion does not have to exist to justify the imposition of martial law; it is enough that it becomes imminent—that invasion, insurrection or rebellion impends.

Thirdly, the proclamation of martial law is a political act. The sole judge of the basis for this act is the president; he alone, decides on whether or not it is necessary to declare martial law and he is accountable to no one except the people themselves. This is the well-accepted juridical principle, a principle reaffirmed more strongly by our present Supreme Court in the case of Lansang vs. Juan Enrile et al. in December last year.

In addition, these provisions in the Constitution conceived of the Armed Forces of the Philippines as the implementing arm of this extraordinary power of the President to declare martial law. It is the Armed Forces of the Philippines that is given the responsibility of maintaining this last line of defense resorted to by the President in the face of an insurgency that threatens the very safety, integrity and existence of the Republic.

It is a credit to the wisdom of the framers of our Constitution who in 1934 and 1953, as they envisioned the Republic, wisely and with great foresight anticipated a social ferment in our history when we would have to avail of a constitutional means effective and strong enough to ward off the dangers to the Republic. This is something to marvel at because the conditions obtaining in the mid-thirties were relatively more peaceful and hopeful. However, our wise forebears most probably had a good grasp of the implications of freedom finally being achieved by the Filipino people, that in the achievement of this freedom, their long suppressed yearning would be let loose and that in the exercise of their rights, they might just overstep the bounds of their corresponding responsibilities, and it is precisely for this reason, it would seem, that the postwar period which finally saw us in complete possession of our sovereignty and independence, also witnessed the disintegration of our society, so much so that in the end, specifically on the 21st day of last September, the President had to take this last constitutional recourse vested in him by the fundamental law of the land—the declaration of martial law.

In its deeper and far-reaching implications, martial law is implemented to balance the relationship between freedom and responsibility or, to paraphrase a great american jurist, to canalize within bounds liberty or freedom in order to prevent it from overflowing.

In fact, our overriding intention at the moment is to extirpate the excesses in the exercise of the rights and freedoms granted in our free society, not to destroy them but to preserve them. The major surgery of society being performed has no other purpose but to regenerate the democratic processes; reform, ladies and gentlemen, is the scalpel that will remove the abcesses in our social, political and economic way of life.

The proper exercise of martial law by our Armed Forces, as I mentioned earlier, is what distinguishes it from the experienced by other countries, called out to dismantle the communist apparatus in the country and to preserve national peace and security. Our Armed Forces have so far lived up to the expectations of our people by carrying out their tasks with a splendid display of unity, discipline, loyalty, efficiency, and utmost humanity.

They have zealously followed the guidelines set by the civilian authority; they realize that even as they have been given a greater role in running the affairs of government, they must always subordinate themselves to civilian authority since civilian authority remains supreme.

It is important to stress that no military takeover is involved. Our Armed Forces have been assigned specific tasks to perform only in aid of civilian authority. Furthermore, in sharp contrast to the manner martial law has been instituted and implemented in other parts of world, in our country the law of the camp has not become the law of the land. Martial law does not supplant, but merely supplements, civilian authority.

I am happy to teil you, ladies and gentlemen, that the officers and men of the Armed Forces of the Philippines welcome their role under the new society and that they regard it as a singular opportunity to prove their worth. They are highly motivated and totally committed to the task of transforming our social order.

It is reform that is giving shape to the new society, reform of the individual and collective components of Philippine society. Reform is the strong thread that weaves through proclamation 1081 and the subsequent decrees, orders and letters of instructions of the President, the vital documents on the declaration of martial law which continue to grow in volume, embody various reforms which sum up our aspirations and ideals as a people.

Under the leadership of President Marcos, we have defined these goals:

The preservation of peace and order, an essential requirement for any society which seeks to protect and reinforce its capacity and freedom to carry out a program or orderly development.

The development of a new morality, which initially began with the overhaul and reform of the government service and which ultimately is designed to inculcate in the whole society the value of merit, honesty, integrity, dignity, efficiency, and professional competence. In this regard, our overall goal is the promotion of individual and national discipline. Aside from the educational reforms which seek to reorient our attitudes and goals, especially among our youth, we have the example of the Armed Forces of the Philippines in their display of discipline to guide us toward self and national restraint. It is our hope that the discipline required of the Filipino soldier will be transmitted to the public officer and the private citizen.

Educational Reforms will likewise develop for us the necessary professional and work force that will carry on a systematic development of the national economy, which in the final analysis will be the most significant and crucial in the present undertaking.

We can see from the directives of the President that he is moving steadily and decisively in the direction of intensified economic development. Through his decrees, orders and letters of instructions, we witness his determination and resolve to free idle capital and channel it into productive areas, to attract foreign capital investments in industrial activities where we lack the necessary huge capital outlays and the required technology, to correct and eliminate obstacles to the full play of free and fair competition in business and industry, and to provide incentives and support for high priority agricultural and industrial projects. The President has underlined the need for labor intensive industries and their dispersal in order to generate high employment opportunities among both urban and rural workers.

Our unity as a people, our disciplined conduct of our affairs and our consistent application of our energies and talents in the resolution of our problems will decide the outcome of the present national enterprise.

We should bear in mind that we are in a transition period, at the crossroad of our history; circumstances compelled us to take this course, initially fraught with risks, but the clouds of apprehension, distrust and skepticism have gradually lifted and we find ourselves at the threshold of a New Society. Our goals have been defined and the road has been cleared of the old social, political and economic structures and empediments and we now have this great opportunity to enter into a new social order.

The prospects are bright, I can assure you; with the advent of the next year, our people will decide whether or not to ratify a new constitution that will eventually supplant our present charter. Before martial law, we had reason to be skeptical about the finalization of this new charter; in fact, the progress of the Constitutional Convention was bogged down by political intransigence. Now we can look forward to a much earlier plebiscite; from what we have read of the charter draft to be finalized this week, it will contain most of the reforms we want of our society.

Some of these provisions lay stress on the accountability of public officials, the rights and corresponding obligations of every citizen, and the equitable diffusion of property ownership and profits without, however, abrogating totally the concept of private property.

Under the proposed charter, an ad-interim assembly will, among others, lay down measures for the eradication of graft and corruption, programs for the maintenance of peace and order and the implementation of agrarian reforms, and other laws designed to close the gap between the rich and the poor.

Those of us who have sworn ourselves to the execution of the plans and programs of the President in the establishment of a new social order, have vowed to carry on the job even at the cost of our very lives. There is no room for hesitation or doubt; we have plotted our course and we intend to follow it towards its successful conclusion. Whatever others may say of our decision, we will stick to it because we believe firmly in the saying of that great American president who led the United States in a time of grave peril—Abraham Lincoln—that we have to do the very best we know how and to keep on doing so until the end because if the end brings us all right, what is said against us won't amount to anything, but if the end brings us out wrong, ten angels swearing we were right would make no difference.

I ask you, as historians and social scientists and as educators, to join us in this national endeavor because I know you, too, believe that this is the only course left to us and that this is the only answer to the problems of our time.

If we succeed, and I am confident we will succeed, we will finally achieve what we aspired for when we defined our goals in the preamble of our Constitution and which we are about to reaffirm in the new charter—that we enjoy "the blessings of independence under a regime of justice, peace, liberty and equality."

Thank you.

Government and Public Administration in Contemporary History

Gerardo P. Sicat

I AM FORTUNATE for being given the opportunity to discuss the topic "Government and Public Administration in Contemporary History." It has forced me to come to grips with problems and developments which are not necessarily germane to my duties as a government official but which are nonetheless important from my view.

It is especially worth noting that perhaps, such a perspective is called for in view of the period we are now undergoing, which is one of transition.

Proclamation 1081 was made by President Marcos to protect the state and form a New Society.

Engulfed by this revolution from the top, we find ourselves caught in a maelstorm of reforms so rapid, that things of slow moving change we were used to yesterday now belong to the past.

Also, the country is looking forward to a new Constitution which shall be the subject of a referendum within two

---

* Speech delivered in the Annual Seminar on History of the Philippine Historical Association at the Centro Escolar University, Manila, on Nov. 29, 1972.

months. If accepted and ratified by our people in 1973, it will constitute the supreme law that will govern us in the following decades of our history.

To review the historical developments both in government and public administration in the contemporary scene simply leads us to the period immediately preceding Proclamation 1081, which in sum carries the tone of growing restlessness and distrust over the competence of the state to manage its affairs properly.

The Colonial Years and Self-Government

All historians will say that we have inherited both the good and the bad from our colonial legacy. The legacy of a well-respected government during the colonial era indicated the level of discipline that we had hoped to maintain.

There is something to be said about the wave of nationalism exemplified most typically by President Quezon's slogan: "I prefer a government run like hell by Filipinos than a government run like heaven by Americans." Quezon did not mean to say that Filipinos were to run a hell of government. On the contrary, it was his manner of asserting that if ever we were capable of running our government with the most imaginable inefficiency, we were also just as capable to correct such inefficiencies through internal reforms.

Economic Philosophy in Government

This apparently constitutes a mainstream in the philosophical thinking of many of our leaders: the vision that public administration was going to wield minimal hindrances to the activities of private individuals. Thus, the philosophy upheld was to allow as much private initiative in determining the development of our natural resources, our industrial and manufacturing enterprises, and our commerce.

Thus, upon the approval of the 1935 constitution, we laid down the foundation of an organic structure for an independent government run by and for Filipinos. I mention these things because they are relevant to "contemporary" history which, if my suspicion is correct, refers to the "postwar" period and the present.

The Trauma from the War

We have experienced a psychological trauma from the war which opened our eyes to a regime of hardship and painful adjustments. The pangs of survival from the Japanese occupation accentuated the need for food, shelter and security and gave rise to a variety of odd and lowly jobs for those who tried to eke out a livelihood.

During this period, the problem of peace and order also took firm roots. Not all the guns in the country were really surrendered to the government after the war—which made for a convenient armory of sorts for the evil elements that were to emerge.

The Problems of Rehabilitation

The destruction of physical infrastructure also brought in the cumbersome process of rehabilitation which was necessary to house government civil servants decently, and to carry out their duties with some amount of respectability and convenience. This deplorable situation was true for educational facilities as well as for other government services.

While in the reconstruction work we made as much use of the war damage payments from the United States government, it was also true that we were unable to get enough resources for rebuilding our independent government on as firm a footing as we would have wanted.

This historical backdrop: the war, the problems of recovery and the uncertainty that the war has caused, all together molded what is now "contemporary" history.

The Contemporary Scene—Growth of Political Power

Throughout the postwar years, certain developments typified governmental processes. The first was the growth in the power of the politician, both in the national and local levels. The premium attached to political patronage (*padrino* system) symbolized the extent of this power which has done more harm than good. It was good only in the sense that people developed channels for communicating their problems to government through the political leaders.

On the other hand, it bred political mendicancy or psychological dependence on political favors which would be difficult to realize anyway, considering that in the end the politician would be constrained ultimately by government's resource limitations and the inability to generate enough revenues.

Imbalance Between Appropriations and Resources

The constituted government prior to Proclamation 1081 even developed a Congress reputed for its tendency to pass appropriation laws for the benefit of this or that agency, program, or interest group, involving sums of money that rose geometrically in relation to the arithmetic increase of the total resources generated by government to fund such activities. Appropriations of up to ₱15 billion were authorized to finance certain types of expenses approved by Congress. The government, however, could only raise revenues of up to ₱4.5 to ₱5 billion.

This gap between wants and resources had grown and created an unhealthy imbalance between the legislative powers of Congress and the executive powers of the President.

As Congress continued to authorize more and more expenditures, it had overshot the limits that it was willing to tax from the citizenry. Thus, Congress gradually lost control over the budget thereby shifting this responsibility to the Office of President. Consequently, the powers of the purse shifted on to planning offices and what would have been simply ministerial agencies (such as the Budget Commission) to undertake functions that have been delegated by the Constitution only to Congress.

Budget Approval Depends on Politicians

It is hard to reconcile the observed growth in the power of the politician with his lost power in relation to the budget. Actually, with regards to budget approval, the politician still reigned supreme in the sense that he continued to use his influence as a representative of the people to push certain activities through. It turned out that the weight of his recommendations as well as his association with the administration had always been an important factor in ramming a budget through.

Political interference too seemed to have mangled civil service out of all self-respect. It has preyed upon the civil service system with its powers, squeezing in favored people into choice civil service slots that were beyond the competence of such recommendees.

The growth of legislation had compounded the problems of inefficient governmental foundations. The confusing mess of legislation were all evidences of patchwork solutions to deep-rooted problems. Legislation which persistently failed to strike at the heart of a problem, concerned only with the surface symptoms, camouflaged rather than cured the ills.

The Legislator and His Legal Palliatives

A medical analogy would be aspirins. The legislator gave aspirins for headaches quite automatically where the problem had to do with eyesight. Only corrective lenses would have cured the sickness, but true enough aspirins seemed to drive away headaches just as fast everytime they came. Only, legislators forgot to ask what kept the headaches coming in the first place. The problems were rooted deep and the legal palliatives only made them more difficult to diagnose.

Like a water tank that leaked from pressure, leaks were patched up when what was needed was a larger and stronger body. Similarly, legislators just did with stop-gap measures although the system needed a complete overhaul.

Creation of New Agencies and the Current Budget

Often, if an agency was unable to address itself to certain problems, a new agency would be created, only to weaken the former agency and incur additional overhead for government. Here all the development agencies were prime examples of such bodies that operated simply to waste salaries on principal officers, clerks and janitors without any meaningful program of action or purpose.

Government salaries as a proportion of the current national budget therefore came to a staggering 70 per cent. This was due to a fat list of ineffective agencies tacked on one way or the other to the tails of the executive department.

There had been another reason for this proliferation: namely, civil service protection. In some instances, a whole bureau had grown stagnant with age and irresponsive to modern day innovations. However, civil service rules outlawed the firing of such office personnel except for *proven* administrative infractions. Thus, many young technocrats preferred to get a new set of brains under a new agency to duplicate the function that the former should have been performing all along. Another reason too was that politicians found new committees, agencies, bureaus, commissions to be good employment featherbeds for their constituents. It was also the least expensive and most politically-attractive placement that politicians could offer.

The proliferation of agencies had also added to the maze of communications within the government widening the opportunities for communication lapses not only within, but worse, among agencies. Such were the signs that Perkinson's law had been taking rampant effect.

The Underestimation of Economics

One of the other aspects I want to touch on is the inadequate appreciation of economics in helping solve some problems of government. One recalls the presumably not serious comment of President Magsaysay when he said that he must repeal the law of supply and demand, which one member of his cabinet had mentioned in passing. Such events are now classic examples that indicate how communications about economic problems may be better improved. I must add that the tendency to look at things from a traditional viewpoint without regard for economic laws had compounded the situation and led to a general mistrust of government. Corruption that had been bred by ill-advised policies running counter to certain principles of economics tended to give too much power to certain officials.

Past experience in relation to the passage of laws which were not economically sound were a testimony to the disastrous consequences on public morals and morale. The laws on import controls and exchange controls had given us our first experience with a massive corruption network on a national scale, which, of course, gave us something of a bitter lesson and which was later on dismantled.

But a system where people have been prone to corruptive practices, whether they be in or outside government, can only breed more corruption to fortify itself.

There was not a level in government spared from the corruption plague. Its tentacles penetrated down to the smallest bureau and the whole government prestige was jeopardized. Honest officials and public servants were swept into the mire of suspicion. Against this across-the-board reputation, the only recourse for some was to join the bandwagon. No amount of denial could purgate one's hand of guilt. The few that stuck to their sanity and principles were morally broken. The President has summed it all in one term SICK in his state of the nation message on January 1972.

Judicial Corruption

Corruption in the judiciary undermined the faith of the people in the processes. True enough, money did not only do the talking, but even worse, the decision-making. Even public works suffered from indiscriminate injunction suits filed in right-of-way cases. Development bogged down from the selfish unproductive interests of a moneyed and well-connected few. Often, there would be an irrational freeze on development programs to the detriment of industrial dispersal, regional industrialization and income distribution, all established national objectives.

Executive Corruption

The executive branch was not absolved of this; in fact it was the worst afflicted.

The RCA is a well-publicized case in point. We have other glaring examples as fixing in the regulatory agencies like the LTC, LRC, PSC where premiums had been attached to personal signatures. The formidable customs front had been one big bonanza of hot money. Anybody who has had the enviable experience of having to secure anything from customs can recount in detail the personal battle they had to wage against the assessing vultures. This was one area where honesty was grossly penalized with paper delays and where "ungreased" documents flowed at such a grudging pace.

We often saw employees of the revenue-collecting agencies of the government treating or being treated at such plush places like the Hilton. Many officials from the executive branch with their low salary levels would still find spare cash to squander on their social debutantes.

Legislative Corruption

In the legislative branch corruption was less obvious but not necessarily less-publicized. Interest groups had preyed on many legislators in exchange for some form of retainer's fees. And election years were no mean occasions for big scale lobbying. Of course, wise legislators played ball with each side and benefited from both until signing came. Nobody ever really knew anymore whether one was elected by virtue of merit or of money votes.

In all this, every public officer (new or experienced) became an automatic victim of guilt by association. Once maligned for any contrivable misdeed, public suspicion was easily aroused and societal decisions were passed even before due process began.

Corruption in Media

Of course, media corruption had its role to play in this scheme. According to where the money winds blew, media made or broke a personality, justifiably or otherwise. It abetted the lack of trust in government. Its free-wheeling nature allowed it to do so, and when media people banded together under the influence of certain moneyed interests, public opinion was effectively controlled towards securing more accommodations for this group.

The whole mechanics is elementary to anyone who has been exposed to mass psychology. And this responsibility of media cannot be underplayed. When media stopped being the watchdog of truth, it became beholden to power groups, and lost all claims to being "free," in any sense of the word.

Such were the weaknesses and ills of the Old Society, that created a myopia in administration which necessitated the reinvestigation to which government is being subjected today. But even before, it had already been felt that this intricate web of inefficiency had to go.

Attempts to Reorganize the Government

In the 1950's some attempts were made to remedy the inefficacy of the government machinery. A reorganization plan was drafted and submitted for approval. Many offices were reorganized. I am, however, most familiar with Plan No. 10 which created the National Economic Council but was ineffective because of the non-acceptance of its complement, Plan No. 11. In any case, the old reorganization plan was on a piece-by-piece basis and suffered some major defects.

In 1968, Congress passed R.A. No. 5435, creating a Commission on Reorganization authorized to prepare a reorganization plan to streamline the whole executive machinery and to define new working relations among agencies. In its declaration of policy the Commission was charged

> ". . . to promote simplicity, economy and efficiency in the government to enable it to pursue programs consistent with national goals for accelerated social and economic development and to improve the service in the executive departments, bureaus and offices, commissions, boards, agencies and instrumentalities of the government, including banking or financing institutions and corporations owned or controlled by the government . . ."

Inaction of Congress and the Constitutional Convention

With its work essentially finished in 1970, the Commission on Reorganization continued to function until 1971 to finalize the reorganization plan which was submitted by the President to Congress on March 3, 1972. The Reorganization Commission addressed itself to this task. Some provisions of the Plan were deemed unacceptable to members of Congress and no action on it was taken. Based on surveys I had personally conducted with many members of Congress before Proclamation 1081, the prospect of its being passed was dim.

Even the Constitutional Convention, charged with framing a new Constitution to embody basic and fundamental laws and ideals, moved with a sluggish pace.

Until suddenly, the imposition of martial law on September 21, 1972, made everything move at express pace.

With the declaration of martial law, the institution of social and economic reforms gained new momentum. The President decreed the implementation of the reorganization plan. The Constitutional Convention speeded up its work and a new constitutional charter was drafted for national approval in a referendum.

Government as an Instrument for Development

The clean-up of undesirable elements in the government, the continued vigilance against the corruptible and the inefficient in both the public and private sectors, the adoption of the reorganization plan with the consequent streamlining of the government machinery, the more realistic appraisal of economic laws—all these have improved the efficiency of the government and have made it a more effective instrument for social progress and economic development.

The change in the tempo of the time will redirect policies and objectives of public administration towards development. A development-oriented government will propel the economy on a sustained growth path necessary to provide the people with greater employment opportunities, higher incomes and better quality and good and services.

In the final analysis, only the tangible results will measure our administrative performance. And this early, I can tell you that we are on the right track.

Scholarship in the New Society

Onofre D. Corpuz

It is certainly impossible to overlook the fact that the program for our opening session this morning was designed to ensure a successful lecture series by prohibiting a long keynote address. I assure you of my dutiful compliance.

Exactly a year ago today the proclamation of martial law was followed by the announcement that its long-term purpose was the establishment and realization of a New Society. On the eve of these two historic events, the social order was in an advanced state of deterioration. Our great political institutions, the political parties, had long become obsolete as the people's instruments of popular control over government and as mechanisms for national decision-making. They had become destitute and utterly bereft of any vestigal sentiments of liberalism and nationalism, for they had metamorphosed into predatory organizations for aggrandizing private ambitions at the expense of the general welfare.

Political perversion infected our civic ethics and political morality, so that those who most indignantly and insistently demanded recognition of their private rights were those who most consistently ignored and violated their public duties.

---

* Keynote address delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the National Historical Commission and the Philippine Historical Association at the University of San Carlos, Cebu City, on Sept. 21, 1973.

The mass media of the old society aggravated our social deterioration. The families and interests that controlled the media were illiterate in the philosophy of liberty and responsibility. They exercised the freedom of the press and expression ruthlessly, in the process destroying a more ancient freedom and a more precious right, the right of a man to a good name and the individual's right to human dignity. The media deceived the people during elections, by creating the illusion that suffrage meant genuine political alternatives, when in fact the voters had no real choice amongst candidates who were mostly scoundrels, warlords and opportunists. Finally, the media escalated the vocabulary of violence, conditioning the people's minds to extremism and revolution, thus destroying every argument for political moderation and reason.

As a result, the old government had become impotent. It lost the capability to manage the public business, to preside over the development effort to educate the people in civic and political morality.

Government, in other words, had ceased to be the steward of the public welfare. It was the government of the people, but it could not govern the nation. As President Marcos has said, the first duty of government is to govern, for otherwise it loses any claim to our physical obedience and to our moral allegiance. Democracy, in the President's view, is not a system of government that is destined or condemned to failure, and impotenced democracy is a people's successful response to severe political stresses and economic difficulties. Perhaps a relevant contemporary argument against weak government is that it is a threat to justice and liberty, for a government that cannot redress wrongs cannot protect rights.

It is now twelve months since the establishment of the New Society. All the evidence indicates that the overwhelming majority of our people approve of the government's performance, its straightforward approach to sticky problems, its deliberate style of programming the attainment of development objectives.

How about scholarship in the New Society? It is truly an honor for me to have been invited to speak out a few thoughts on this important question? Since it is complex, I will be brief, and I shall hold myself to the fundamentals.

You will doubtless require that I attend to at least two issues, namely: what are the areas of study that are open to scholarly inquiry in the New Society?; and what are the limits to the freedom of scholarship in the New Society?

I settled these questions for my own self long ago. The only behavior befitting to a scholar is scholarly behavior, which means the consistent application of reason, and the creative intellectual imagination to one's field of competence. Immediately after September 1972, I addressed myself to the critical and grave issues of the New Society. I examined the question of its legitimacy, both according to constitutional as well as moral considerations. I inquired into the issue of democracy and its compatibility with the new order. I undertook a serious re-thinking of liberty, rights and welfare in the light of the New Society. I discussed my unfolding thoughts with both friends and strangers, and had occasion to make a few public speeches presenting those ideas on which I had already developed more or less firm positions.

Political legitimacy, democracy, liberty and rights—what topics can be more sensitive than these? I engaged in these inquiries because they fall within my areas of scholarly interest, and I hope to publish them in polished form soon.

Perhaps I should add that these are the most exciting times for me as a scholar. The New Society wrenches and tears us away from the comfortable notions and conventional concepts of our established political traditions. We are challenged to reexamine political ideas that have become established concepts in our political vocabulary, to discover their relevant and contemporary meanings from a study of their ancient roots and origins. I trace, for instance, a number of our dominant political concepts to the nineteenth century European enlightenment, then to the U.S. constitution, the social contract theories of the eighteenth century, to the English revolution of 1688, even to the New Testament and the early Christian philosophers, all the way to the Greeks. In a few crucial cases, I discover that some of our present-day difficulties in political theory are caused by our ignorance of the fact that much of our conceptual vocabulary of politics has been shaped by a specifically American, and therefore narrow, tradition.

I have cleared my thoughts with no one, and nobody has required me to explain or justify my ideas. The only restraints imposed by the New Society on scholarship today are: that no one must destroy another's right to a good reputation or a good name; and that no one must incite to sedition or rebellion. Every government worthy of its name must adopt these restraints, but since slander and libel are not marks of scholarship and I have more important task than inciting to rebellion, I do not find these restraints any bother at all.

The scholar is free not because of the absence of external restraints, but because he has competence, imagination, and discipline. Freedom is the capability to develop to the fulness of one's potential. You may abolish all external restraints, place a man in the middle of the Sahara desert where no one can enslave him and no law restrain him, but if he cannot produce a work of scholarship he is not a scholar. Competence is vital to scholarship, because ignorance is fatal. Imagination is necessary, because scholarship is and must always be an act of creation, never of repetition or plagiarism. And discipline is a pre-requisite to scholarly work because, as Hegel once put it, one must know the laws of grammar in order to produce great literature, just as it is necessary to follow the notes of the scale before one can create beauty in music.

On the whole, there is hardly any difference at all in the status of scholarship before and under the New Society. Some prudence is necessary in consideration of martial law, but the restraints are exceedingly moderate and free from harshness. On the other hand, there is compensation in the vast new opportunities for reexamining many of the concepts that we used to accept with question. This reexamination will surely generate ideas that are Filipino.

Perhaps there is a subtle difference, after all. Scholarship inevitably reflects what we are, and Filipino scholarship cannot fail to be a mirror of our virtues, our strenghts and weaknesses. Under the New Society, there is a desire to promote scholarship that reflects the best in us, our virtues, our aspirations, our strengths. We can accept this, and scholarship and scholars will be the gainers in the New Society.

The Study and Interpretation of History

Celedonio O. Resurrección

THE LAST TWO DECADES witnessed a felicitous renaissance among Filipinos in the field of history. The resurgence may be attributed partly to the national euphoria engendered by political emancipation, which eventually was followed by a sober search for national identity through the development of national consciousness.

The promotion of historical-mindedness and scholarship may also be traced partly to the formation of associations composed of professional historians, history teachers, and the so-called *aficionados de la historia*, those intellectual dilettantes who strayed, by accident [1] or otherwise, into the fascinating field of history. The elevation of the former Historical Committee in the Department of Education to the status of a Commission has contributed a great deal to the stimulation of historical interest.

Despite the proliferation of historical associations of national, regional, and local scope, we note with a sense of tragic disappointment, but not with hopeless despair, a relatively critical scarcity of historians, compared to the abundance of those who take up the glamorous and the utilitarian courses. Among those who are already in the field of history, there is likewise noted a relative paucity of productive scholarship: few are doing research and writing.

---

* Paper read in the Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at the Silliman University, Dumaguete City, on January 22, 1972.

[1] To cite an example, there were on the 1971 board of governors of the Philippine Historical Association a physician, a college dean, a professor of economics, a professor of law and political science, a professor of philosophy and humanities, a professor of criminology, a librarian-archivist, and an ex-army man besides the professional historians—all avid students of history.

By productive scholarship we do not mean the substantial repetition of historical accounts. We do not have in mind the activities of journalistic writers, the romanticist narrators, whose aim is to provide entertainment rather than to contribute to historical thinking. We do not refer to textbook writers who are mere compilers or collectors of chronicles exhumed from dusty cobwebbed attics of the past for material rather than intellectual ends. We mean, rather, the writing of history in the true sense of the Greek word *historia*, which is an inquiry, an interpretation and study of the character and significance of events.[2] For the propensity to repeat recorded events, without subjecting them to critical judgment, led Philip Guedalla to remark that "history does not repeat itself; it is historians who repeat one another."[3] Vico has a harsh description of the pseudo-historians—"bankruptcy of the mind."[4] Croce's is milder—"mental impotence."[5] Collingwood's is most contemptuous—"scissors-and-paste historians."[6]

The present state of affairs is open to several possible expressions. In this paper, I single out one, and this refers to the background of those who profess interest in history. Many are ill-prepared to be their own historians. They are ill-equipped, if equipped at all, to write even their personal diaries. They prepare no travel notes, they do not record their impressions, they do not write memoirs or reminiscences, they don't preserve flashes of ideas or momentary illumination of the intellect.

That is why we think, with a sense of confidence, that Carl

---

[2] Hans Kohn, *Reflections of Modern History* (Princeton, New Jersey, D. Van Nostrand, 1963), p. v.

[3] Quoted by Bindolf in H. P. R. Finberg, *Approaches to History* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962), p. 4.

[4] Quoted by Benedetto Croce, *History as the Story of Liberty* (New York, Meridian Books, 1965), p. 33.

[5] Croce, *op.* and *loc. cit.*

[6] R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (New York, 1946), p. 257-266.

Becker's dictum "everyman is his own historian"[7] may be true in the American context of the relativist school, but not in the Philippine context. Not that we have no sense of history—we have—but that we are woefully not prepared for the task. Not that our thousands of history teachers have no time for reflective thinking—they have—but that they have never been honest-to-goodness students of the historian's craft. Their intellectual inadequacy is transformed into a feeling of inner insecurity that manifests itself as barrenness, as incapacity for scholarly pursuit. Many of us are like the fool, the simple man, and the sleeping man, but not the wise man, in the Persian proverb:

> He who knows not and knows not he knows not
> is a fool—avoid him;
> He who knows not and knows he knows not
> is simple—teach him;
> He who knows and knows not he knows
> is asleep—wake him;
> He who knows and knows he knows
> is wise—follow him.

A requisite for a fruitful inquiry is wisdom. The wise man is a mellowed product of knowledge and experience. The wise man is a paradigm of every historian. We may disagree with the historical school of "objective relativism," but at least we owe to it the claim that history is "a quest for wisdom instead of a quest for certainty."[8] To be ultimately a wise man, we must begin properly as students and remain in the profession as students.

There exists a striking difference between the historian and the student of history. While the professional historian leads, the student follows. While the historian recreates or reproduces the past, the student consumes the historian's fare. While the historian sets the mood, the intellectual and spiritual climate, the student goes through the experience, perhaps imaginatively and with delectable gusto, or perhaps with mental reservation for a parenthetical remark on the quality of the manna from the historian. While the historian shares with the world the results of his scholarly research, the student places himself in such a manner as to receive the best exposure to his findings.

---

[7] Cited by Louis Gottschalk, *Understanding History* (New York, A. A. Knopf, 1963), p. 195 note.

[8] C. Vann Woodward, "The Future of the Past," in *American Historical Review*, Vol. LXXV, No. 3 (Feb. 1970).

The contrast terminates here, however, for there are many points of convergence of the historian and the student. Both deal with the same subject—the past. Both have the same passion—historical truth. Both show the same concern—objectivity, and tolerance. Both seek identical ends—a methodical, rational explication of man's behavior in the totality of his complex inter-relationships in the past.

Thus one might say that the novice student and the professional historian differ only in degree of knowledge, experience, and wisdom. Hence it is imperative that the novice student keep on enlarging his perspective and elevating himself to the stature of a full-fledged historian.

WHY WE SHOULD STUDY HISTORY

Essential to the tempering down of our charged reaction or response to the daily occurrences in society is historical understanding. Historical understanding has been defined as "the exercise of the capacity to follow a story, where the story is known to be based on evidence and is put forward as a sincere effort to get at the story so far as *the* evidence and the writer's general knowledge and intelligence allow."[9]

Historical understanding is more than mere knowledge. It connotes acceptance of explanations of causal and functional relationships of man in his complex social organization. Explanations are essential aids to the acquisition of a tolerant attitude, which enables us to assess and construe correctly mankind's behavior in the past.

The study of history enables the student to exercise the faculty of criticism. Through intelligent reading, the student discovers his own image, which is often distorted by personal bias and prejudice, which he may attempt to reform. He becomes liberated.

---

[9] W. B. Gallie, *Philosophy and the Historical Understanding* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1964), p. 109.

Capacity for self-criticism is not the only gift of historical understanding. The student discovers also the strength and weakness of the author. He can raise questions, analyze his assumptions and arguments, and criticize his judgments. The right to make positive or negative criticism goes as a requisite to the acceptance or rejection of the historian's analyses and conclusions.

Another reason for the study of history may be given. The activities of social institutions are at first blush inexplicable. They are beyond explanation except through historical knowledge and understanding. We can never explain, for instance, the apparently irrational demands and activities of radical students and other participants in the so-called "parliament of the streets", unless we first acquire knowledge of the history of prior student revolts in the United States and in European countries. We can never understand the present conduct of political parties, unless we know how political parties in the Philippines have gradually developed into the institutions that they are today. Lastly, to exemplify once more, we are at a loss to explain the so-called union mentality, the choleric utterances of unionists at the labor-management confrontation, unless we know the genesis of the labor movement.

Quite paradoxically, the past has nothing to teach to the present, but the present can learn something *about* the past. We therefore study history in order to learn what man did in the past so that we can gain an insight into the nature of our present difficulties.

Historical consciousness is essential to national development.[10] The quest for national identity is chimerical enough, but historical-mindedness can bring us closer to it. It is easy, for instance, to dismiss the proposal to change the name of the Philippines.[11] But if one possesses historical knowledge and understanding, the proposal receives a second thought and is likely to find acceptance. This is because a proposal without historical support has nothing to stand on, while the same proposal backed up by documentation inspires certainty, understanding, and acceptance.

---

[10] John Lukacs, *Historical Consciousness* (New York, Harper & Row, 1968), p. 39-40.

[11] C. O. Resurreccion, "Why We Should Change the Name Philippines," in *Historical Bulletin*, Vol. XI (June 1967), p. 153-168.

In cultural anthropology we are unearthing artifacts that tend to answer the age-old question, "*What* was the Filipino?" We have succeeded, through the pioneering work of a scholar, Dr. Dominga Abella, in providing a definitive answer to the historical anomaly, "*Who* was the Filipino during the Spanish rule in the islands."[12]

So much for the reasons of studying history at which we have made no attempt to be exhaustive.

HOW TO STUDY HISTORY

How should history be studied? What are the tools that a learner needs and what methods should he employ? What values and traits must be developed? What qualities of the mind must he cultivate?

"For our purpose, the main thing to learn is not the art of accumulating material, but the sublimer art of investigating it, of discerning truth from falsehood and certainty from doubt. It is by solidity of criticism more than by the plenitude of erudition, that the study of history strengthens, and straightens, and expands the mind.[13] This is sound advice from John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, better known simply as Lord Acton.[14]

To learn the sublimer art of investigation, the student must develop proper attitudes, provide himself with the necessary equipment, and employ certain specialized tools.

Attitudes.—It is a desideratum for the would-be historian that he develop correct attitudes, namely: (1) an open mind, (2) a determination to learn, and (3) a willingness to exploit or use historical ideas. An open mind calls for tolerance and objectivity. Tolerance, because every historian is a corporeal symbol of intellectual honesty, a guardian of historical truth. Objectivity, because the novice student has to learn the distinctive way of thinking of historians, their materials for critical inquiry, and their methodology of dealing with their materials.

---

[12] Domingo Abella, "Primary Documents showing that Bishop Miguel Lino de Espeleta of Cebu was a Full-blooded Spaniard," in *Historical Bulletin*, Vol. IV (Sept. 1960), pp. 100-107.

[13] Lord Acton, *Lectures on Modern History* (London, Macmillan & Co., 1956), p. 15.

[14] He was Regis Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. He prepared the plan of the "Cambridge Modern History."

A determination to learn is another desideratum. History is a synoptic behavioral study of man in the past. It is so vast in scope, beset with formidable difficulties and obstacles, that it is rigorously demanding. Only a tenacious determination can make a student plod on toward success through his personal involvement and hard study. No one can become a success except through personal hard work. There is no such thing as "instant historian," no such thing as an "armed-chair historian." The student who desires to achieve must continually keep on reading and reflecting, examining documents and philosophizing, reviewing and re-interpreting events. For such is the substance of history—interpretation. That is why history is viewed in different light by different periods; that is why history as interpretation is always contemporary and subjective.

Willingness to exploit contributions to historical thought is the third type of attitude. A student must not be an indifferent, unconcerned bystander. He must seize every historical reflection of others as an opportunity for building onto it an additional edifice of ideas, for innovating, or for remodelling.

For instance, an account of the battle of Bangkusay in 1571 reported that the leader of the native warriors died with some three hundred of them. Austin Craig theorized that this slain leader was Rajah Sulaiman, and all the students of history and textbook writers thereafter repeated Craig's speculalation as if it were a fact of history. Did Rajah Sulaiman die at Bangkusay? No, answered a thoughtful and challenging student of history, who cited authorities showing that Rajah Sulaiman was seen later in Pampanga, that he, together with Lakandula and other chieftains, conspired to stage a revolt against the Spaniards, that in 1574 the abortive revolt was discovered and suppressed by the authorities and their leaders were executed, among whom were Lakandula and Rajah Sulaiman.[15] Here we have an illustration of how a student of history can overthrow a prevailing theory. It is in the very nature of all historical truths that they are *prima facie* until overthrown by a superior theory.

Equipment.—The cultivation of proper attitudes is not enough. The earnest student must acquire certain equipment as well as certain desirable habits to enable him to pursue his task effectively. What are these essential equipment and study habits?

The student must have a working knowledge of the language in which historical documents of his country are largely written. In the Philippines, the language is predominantly Spanish and partly Arabic. Historians would be ill-advised to rely on translations. The novice student must endeavor to develop the habit of consulting primary sources. Ideally, a historian must be a polyglot because there are valuable accounts written in other foreign languages, like French, Italian, German, Dutch, and English, and not unlikely in Chinese, Japanese, Indonesian, Malaysian, Thai, Khmer, and Vietnamese. The novice historian might as well begin with Spanish and expand later to the other languages.

Next, the student of history must be able to think logically and systematically.[16] Like the historians whose works he is reading, the student should be able to mellow the author's methodology of inquiry and interpretation. If he be incapable of doing this, no amount of reading would enable him to understand and appreciate the historian's effort at establishing cause-and-effect relationships. He would be incapable of critical judgment.

To explain subsequent events, the historian searches out for causes from the myriads of events in the treasury of the past. The choice of causes cannot be whimsical, capricious, and conveniently self-serving. It is myopic historianship to limit oneself to immediate and proximate incidents to explain a subsequent event. As the student moves along with the argumentation of the author, he should be able to evaluate the validity of the explanation offered.

---

[15] Nicolas Zafra, "Rajah Soliman — a National Problem."

[16] Donald B. Gawrenski, *History: Meaning and Method* (Rev. ed., Glenview, Illinois, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1969), p. 11.

For instance. It is a well-known fact that Raja Matanda (Lakandola) cooperated with the Spaniards and facilitated the peaceful submission of numerous barangay chiefs in Central Luzon and that, in contrast, his nephew Raja Sulaiman resisted the imposition of Spanish sovereignty. These are plain simple facts. In the hands of the historian, these facts are transformed into historical facts when he, the historian, recreates them imaginatively by inquiring into relationships between the uncle and the nephew, by exploring deeper into the behavioral motivations especially of Raja Matanda. Having learned of the historian's explanation, the student may now pause for a little reflection. Does he agree with the historian Does he believe with what a Europocentric historian calls "Lakandola's diplomacy of persuasion"?[17]

Another essential tool is a sense of time. By its very nature, history is not static. Events do not develop in time but through time. In other words, history is diachronic (from *dia* through and *kronos* times). In Hegelian terms, events have their stage of synthesis extending to some remote past and a stage of antithesis where they gradually wane off or fade out at some indistinct future time.

Dates are important tools. There seems to be a growing consensus among progressive historians that far more important than exact dates of events is their proper sequential order.[18] The study of history should not be reduced to rote memorization of dates. That would be meaningless and wasteful because they are insignificant by themselves. Yet they have relative importance when posited with other historic events. The day on which Magellan died in the Philippines is relatively insignificant. What is of real importance is that on that same date, chieftain Lapulapu dared him and put up an admirable defense of his territory against a foreign invader.[19]

---

[17] J. D. Tate, *The Making of Modern South-East Asia*, Vol. I, The European Conquest (Kuala Lumpur, Oxford Univ. press, 1971).

[18] Gawrenski, *op.* and *loc. cit.*

[19] Antonio Pigafetta, "Primo Viaggio Interno al Mundo," in E. H. Blair

Take another example. It was not the colossal size of the invincible Spanish Armada of 27,000 men that is significant. Nor the day of departure or year of invasion. Rather, it was the month when the Armada set sail for England. It was the month of storms in the North Sea. It is now known that the Spanish Armada suffered disaster not from the English but from the storms that sunk the vessels and spared the lives of only 10,000 men who hastily returned to Spain.[20]

From these examples, we can only conclude that we need mature judgment in considering the degree of importance and exactitude of dates. Under all circumstances, however, the historian as well as the novice student must strictly follow correct chronological sequence. For instance, it would be a gross distortion to say that in the libertarian struggles of colonized peoples, Indonesia or Malaysia or India, antedated the Philippines. The reverse is true. As a consequence we have always maintained that it is serious error to compare Jose Rizal with Sun Yat Sen of China and Mahatma Gandhi of India. First, because to follow that order of comparison would violate sequential relationships in history. It is a fact that Jose Rizal was ahead of Sun Yat Sen and Mahatma Gandhi in libertarian work. That is why Rizal was the first great Malayan and the first great Asian. Moreover, in greatness Rizal was head and shoulders above these two Asian patriots. According to Dr. Samuel Johnson, if we recall accurately Boswell's account read some forty years ago, one must never say, Dr. Richardson is as great as Dr. Johnson," because he felt that Dr. Richardson was superior to him. He corrected members of his literary coterie thus: "Dr. Johnson is as great as Dr. Richardson."

There is still a basic equipment for the beginning students and in fact for all students of history, including the professional historians. They must provide themselves at all time with writing materials. Failure to carry these writing materials is a common shortcoming of history students. The study

---

and J. A. Robertson, *The Philippine Islands, 1593-1898*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 175. 183.

[20] Stringfellow Barr, *The Pilgrimage of Western Man* (Rev. ed., Philad., J. B. Lippincott, 1962), p. 106.

of history involves a lot of note-taking and note-comparing. Students should record their impressions, their experience, their critical insight that comes at the inspiration of the moment. These impressions, experience and insight must be captured while they are vivid in the mind. By extension of our illustration, we say that it is serious error of omission for a history student to seek consultation with his faculty adviser, or to attend a history discussion group, or participate in seminars and conferences, without bringing along with him a set of paper and pen.

Of course the most important equipment of the student of history is books—a good dictionary and a fair stock of history journals and history books. A modest library can be built through gradual accumulation. This is the only way for an ordinary student to build his own library—one history book every payday or every month.

With the prevailing high cost of books, one need not despair. The acquisition of books is an ideal objective. But if this be impossible, what is more important is knowing where needed information can be located. If one cannot afford to buy books and subscribe to historical journals, he can resort to the alternative of jotting down notes and making annotated bibliographical entries. This method is inexpensive and has the advantage of note-taking and index-card filing, which private library owners tend to forego because of the accessibility of their books. Mere possession of books and journals is not so helpful as systematic note-taking of read materials and filing them as systematically.

As regards study habits, we need not elaborate too much. Suffice it to say that effective study can only be possible in a place conducive to learning. Therefore the student must avoid all kinds of distraction. He must endeavor, instead, to create a favorable climate for study. He must prepare himself and go through with it. Psychological as well as environmental preparation is of paramount importance. Discussions with history teachers and fellow scholars are helpful. We learn much from the intellectual experience of others.

Lack of time does not permit us to give a full coverage of the preparation of students of history. We beg permission to move to the next part of our topic.

INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY

Interpretation belongs properly to the full-fledged historian. History is thought, not just imagination. History is a philosophical inquiry into causes of historical phenomena, into motivations of human behavior.

Notwithstanding what has just been said, interpretation is not the exclusive preserve of the professional historian. Any student of history has a right to subject his (the historian's) interpretation to a second inquiry, a kind of an echo reaction, a sort of a feedback response. Although interpretation is in the realm of the abstract, that is, in the domain of philosophy, it will do well for every student to keep tract of the various contributions to historical thought. Such a rewarding preoccupation provides a single most important rationale for the study of history.

Someone might ask, why? It is because history is primarily a search for meaning, and the search for meaning requires a formulation of patterns of human behavior in the past deduced systematically and logically. In this respect, the historian is not absolutely free. While he enjoys freedom of choice of his raw materials, the facts in history, and is subject to no restraints in formulating his theory, he is under all circumstances bound by the rules of scientific inquiry that include those of the use of logic, detachment, objectivity, understanding, and language, as well as, specially, in drawing conclusions.

The student should be able to set aside the historical process evolved by the historian. Interpretation is, to repeat, the main function of the historian. To look for that interpretation is and should be the paramount objective of the student.

The student should bear in mind that all interpretations are valid because they are based on the historian's set of assumptions and choices of materials, and because they are derived from particular circumstances selected by the historian himself. In other words, each interpretation is unique and distinct and and is good only for a particular historical situation. That is

Ambeth Ocampo

why history is unique. History is what the historian says it is.[21] Without facts the historian is restless and futile; and without the historian the facts are dead and meaningless, says one historian recently, so that it is clear that history is "a continuous process of interaction between the historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between the present and the past."[22]

Let us now have a peek into some historians' dialogue with the past and be privy to their thoughts.

Cyclical Interpretation.—The cyclical view of history was the first to be widely accepted. It dominated the ancient world from the time of Herodotus (484-425 B.C.) to the time of Jesus Christ. The cyclical theory postulates that all human events take place in cycles; that is to say, what happened before will happen again. This view of history has given currency to the cliche: "History repeats itself."

The cyclical view has been criticized as being not a philosophy of history. A philosophy of history must have a beginning, a middle portion, and a terminus that signifies realization, fulfillment. The cyclical interpretation, it is observed, does not have these earmarks. History is self-repeating. It moves in vicious circle every point of which is a point of departure and simultaneously a point arrived. It means that man is incapable of change and improvement. It assumes that the present is of little or no significance of man's inability to lift himself but from the vicious circular groove.

Formulated at a time when mankind had no knowledge about the world and the universe, about his potentiality and the role that he could play in it, the cyclical view found its validity limited to the primitive. As everyone knows, the primitive has no time perspective. He knows no past to stand on; he knows no future to look forward to. He knows only the present. Alas! the present repeats itself in endless caravan of indentical chores from day to day.[23]

---

[21] Barr, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[23] Gawrenski, *op. cit.*, p. 20-21; Bernard Norling. *Towards a Better Understanding of History* (Notre Dame, Indiana. Notre Dame Univ. Press, 1960), p. 39. See also the excellent discussion of the Greek conception of the cyclical interpretation by Hannh Arendt, *Between Past and Future* (London, Faber & Faber, 1960), p. 41 ff.

Christian Interpretation.—This view resulted from the fact that the early Christians could not reconcile the Messianic promise with the cyclical theory of history. The cyclical view held no prospect of fulfillment for the realization of the promise. Thus, a new theory was conceived, postulating that history moves in a linear direction. The Christian view saw history as a movement from the fall of Adam and Eve in Paradise, through the Incarnation of the Son of God, and ends with the Last Judgment when our world's end shall come.

The Christian interpretation regarded all phenomena, like floods, catastrophes, famines, wars, and the like as acts of God or as intervention of Divine Providence. These are beyond the control of man.

A transitional form of the Christian interpretation of history was formulated by Saint Augustine. He was trying to resolve the great question of his time. Rome had fallen to Alaric and the Goths. If Christ had come to be Savior of the world, why did He allow Rome to be conquered by barbarians who vandalized it? Saint Augustine answered in his book, *De Civitatis Dei* (The City of God); there are two symbolic cities. One is the earthly city, which is mundane and brutish. The other is the city of God, which is the ultimate abode of the good. To reach the city of God, one must behave as a good Christian on earth and must be willing to suffer. The reward is not here but in the life hereafter. The result of the struggle between the forces of good and the forces of evil in human history is either eternal salvation or eternal damnation. Eternal salvation depicts the linear Christian interpretation of history, because there is movement from this world to the next world. Eternal damnation exemplifies the cyclical view, because man does not reach his other destination but remains in the earthly city for good. Saint Augustine therefore was able to synthesize the pagan cyclical view and the Christian linear interpretation of human history.[24]

History as Progress.—With the rise of intellectualism, the development of the Renaissance, and the onset of the Reformation, Christian unity suffered a breakdown. The Providential view of history came under question and was eventually replaced by the view that history is the story of mankind's progress. Man was becoming more and more materialistic at the expense of his spiritual outlook. He was discovering and unfolding the secrets of the universe as a result of which his rise to the level of higher culture became steeply rapid. Accordingly, the human is continually becoming better and better. The view that history is the story of progress is universally adopted by historians.[25]

---

[24] Christopher Dawson, *Dynamics of World History* (Ed. by John J. Mulley; London, Sheed & Ward, 1957), p. 294-325; Gawrenski, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22; Marthinus Versfold, *Guide to the City of God* (London, Sheed & Ward, 1958), *passim.*

A variant of this interpretation is that of Karl Marx.[26] Human history consists of class struggles. The development of those struggles follow the Hegelian dialectics of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. The historical process of the dominant ruling class being replaced by the opposing class continues and will continue until the proletariat class is enthroned and dominates society. By then, society shall have become classless. When social classes disappear, man will achieve complete freedom in a communistic society.

The Marxist interpretation of history has been criticized for attempting to stop history with the triumph of the proletariat class. Why should history stop there? Why were the dialectics applied only to the past but will not be allowed to operate after the triumph of the social revolution of the Marxists? At any rate, the Marxist theory—for that is what it really is: a theory—appears valid vis-a-vis the aspiration of the working class in Marx's time.

Other Interpretations of History.—We are only capable of giving a capsule description of the other interpretations of history.

To Oswald Spengler, cultures have identical patterns of progress and decay; historical process has a cyclical movement.[27]

---

[25] H. E. Barnes, *A History of Historical Writing* (New York, Dover Pub., 1962), pp. 177 ff.; J. B. Burry, *The Idea of Progress* (New York, Dover Pub., 1955), *passim.*; Dawson, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-44; Gawrenski, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-25.

[26] Karl Max and Friedrich Engel, *The Communist Manifesto* (Penguin Books, 1967), *passim.*

Arnold Toynbee offers the "challenge and response" thesis[28] as explanation of the progress of civilizations. His thesis blends the cyclical and the progress interpretations of history.

Condorcet and Turgot of France offer what is known as geographical cyclicaiism with progress and the end result and a cyclical human progression from east to west.[29]

The Darwinian theory of history rests on evolution of human societies. His view was modified by Herbert Spencer who saw history as a movement from the homogeneous to the heterogenous, from the simple to the complex social structures. Thus the Darwinian or evolutionary theory was altered by the Spencerian or cellular theory.[30]

In American historiography, Frederick Turner's frontier thesis was dominant some time. According to his view, American history was the result of the expanding frontier.[31]

Charles A. Beard believes that economic factors have shaped American institutions, government, and subsequent social and economic developments.[32]

One of the latest of major interpretations of the historical process is the urban interpretation of American history formulated by A. M. Schlesinger in 1940, but has only recently gained wide acceptance.[33] According to this view, Turner overlooked the existence of urban areas. With the disappearance of the frontier, Turner himself suggested an urban reinterpretation of American history, which is a valid suggestion in vew of the fact that urban expansion involves not only the geographical or horizontal dimension, but also politics, economics, and other social considerations.

---

[27] Dawson, *op. cit.*, pp. 374-389; Bruce Mazlish, *The Riddle of History* (New York, Harper, 1966), p. 307-350; Patrick Gardiner, ed., *Theories of History* (Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1959), pp. 188-200.

[28] Dawson, *op. cit.*, 390-404; Gardiner, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-210; Mazlish, *op. cit.*, pp. 351-380.

[29] Gawrenski, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-27; Gardiner, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-58; Mazlish, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-100.

[30] Gawrenski, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[31] Billington, in A. S. Bisenstadt, ed., *The Craft of American History*, pp. 135-148.

[32] Charles A. Beard, *The Economic Basis of Politics and Related Writings* (New York, Vintage Books, 1957), *passim.*; Rofstander, in Bisenstadt, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-168.

[33] Saveth, in Bisenstadt, *op. cit.*, 129.

The Illustrations just given are mere samplings of what the students of history are expected to look for in their readings. The inferences are drawn from the set of facts selected by the historian. With experience the students develop skill in identifying and distinguishing factual statements from inferential statements. Such training at identifying historical concepts provides them with assets that will forever be theirs.

You have just gone through a painful but fruitful exercise in re-learning how to study and interpret history. This is, of course, an overstatement. Within the compass of one lecture's duration, no one can honestly claim to have been able to cover the whole dimension of the subject. If the transmitted message is laconic, you do not expect to receive a broader, a more adequate, a longer message than the one transmitted. Without in any manner minimizing whatever has just been articulated here, the textual message is not so important, I feel, as the generation of new interest among you, of a new zeal to conduct a missionary apostleship of Clio's discipline.

As teachers and lovers of history, you have a second personality—you are all students. While as students you hold an abiding dialogue with the past, which is continually renewed from time to time, as teachers you hold communion with the future through your inspiring guidance of the young who sit at your feet to listen to the wisdom of the ages. If you succeed in both, then we know with certainty that the Second Spring has come and we should all go out to greet it with the exuberance of youth for the golden promises it holds out for us.

The Study and Interpretation of History *

Samson A. Lucero

IT IS THE INTENTION of this paper[1] to deal with such closely related topics as "why bother about history," "the study and the teaching of history," "views of history as guide to interpretation," and a brief appraisal of the process of interpretation.

WHY BOTHER ABOUT HISTORY?

In any study of culture and society one question must seem apparent at the outset. Why should anyone bother to attack the life and ideas of men long dead or a social order no longer in existence? Were we not told by Longfellow to "Let the dead past bury its dead?" Why, after all, in any culture should anyone care about what the past was really like? Yet in the great era (last years of the 19th century) of historical awareness intellectuals did care. Ranke, in fact, wanted to show what had actually occurred. These intellectuals cared because they realized the vital ideological importance, in a society like ours, of history and the proper attitudes toward it.

---

* Paper read in the Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at Silliman University, Dumaguete City, on January 22, 1972.

[1] Among the eminent historians whose works were made use of, in this paper, are Nicholas M. Butler who was president of Columbia University and Nobel prize awardee; Robert V. Daniels of the University of Vermont; Dr. Louis Gottschalk who was educated at Cornell University and has been Professor of History at the University of Chicago and from 1937-42 served as Chairman of the Department of History there; Dr. Henry Johnson who was Professor Emeritus of History in Teachers College, Columbia University; William H. Mace who was Professor of History at Syracuse University; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. who studied at Harvard University where he subsequently became a Professor of History; Dr. Warren I. Susman who is Professor of History at Rutgers University; and Wung Gang-Wu who is Professor of History at the University of Malaya.

The "lessons of history" can also be useful if they are properly appreciated. Susman points out that the control over the interpretation of the nature of the past is a burning cultural issue.[2] This is so, he argues, because current ideology is based on a particular view of the nature of the past. Furthermore, present problems are frequently solved by reference to the way past experience dealt with similar problems. It is therefore essential that we have the right view of the past and the proper attitudes toward history in order to operate effectively in the world today and tomorrow. The right view and the proper attitudes can help us to solve our problems and change the course of the stream of history itself. Wung Gang-Wu suggests that the main purposes or uses of history include the desire for group survival, for man to be shown by practical experience what to do and what to avoid in his efforts to improve himself, and for him to know his destiny and comprehend his humanity.[3] The call for a "usable past" at the start of this century indicates a basic agreement that an intelligent study of the past might make possible man's intelligent direction over the future course of history.

INTELLIGENT STUDY AND THE TEACHING OF HISTORY

And what might be an intelligent study of history? According to Mace it involves the understanding of its essential elements and the processes in organizing it.[4] This includes, among other things, ideas of form and content, growth of history, fundamental institutions, process of interpretation and process of coordination. Some of these we shall take occasion to elaborate under interpretation. Meanwhile let us pursue study and teaching.

I have just stated that a study of history is intended to utilize the usable past, to learn the lessons of history and to make this knowledge the stuff by which we can cope with the future. But let us not take this to mean knowledge of things to come. For as Gottschalk says, human beings cannot be counted upon.[5] It is certain that human beings can learn from history, but they can be counted upon neither to do so nor not to do so. If they should learn, the chances of their doing the same thing over if it is desirable, or avoiding it if it is undesirable, are good. But since they cannot be counted upon, historical analysis presents us most often with clues to possible rather than probable behavior, with the ability only to anticipate rather than to predict, to take precautions rather than to control.

---

[2] Warren L. Susman, "History and the American Intellectual," *American Journal*, IV, No. 4 (March 1965).

[3] Wung Gang-Wu, "The Use of History," *USAIHL Bulletin*, XII, Nos. 1-2 (Bangkok, November 1968).

[4] William H. Mace, *Method in History* (New York, 1914).

Herein lies the need for the proper and effective teaching of history. While possibility, anticipation and precaution are well within the competence of the historian as an artist and as such his commitment to stimulate the imagination, the hopes and the aspirations of his public life can be most effective; yet it is equally true that it is within the competence of the good history teacher to do likewise with those of the students. In the last analysis, the intellectual, the teacher and the student of history are one and the same person. The intellectual is an avid student of the past. The product of his incisive study becomes good material for those who would transmit knowledge. The person who is called upon to transmit knowledge, to be a good teacher, must himself be a good student of history. The good student under the guidance and inspiration of a good teacher would eventually become one of the pillars in the whole structure of history as a discipline.

But the focal point in the troika is the teacher himself. Equipped with a good command of the essentials of historical method and the processes in organizing history, he may proceed with confidence in the accomplishment of his assigned task. The teacher is not expected to be everything, but great and wise is one who could apply or enforce a good combination and the right dosage of the principles of causation and chronology plus a good amount of literature in the performance of his functions as a teacher of history.

---

[5] Louis Gottschalk, *Understanding History* (New York, 1950).

One of the crying needs of our educational system today is the kind of teacher who could inspire his students to greater heights of intellectual and moral achievements. If to what many of them have is added a bit of literature, then we shall have produced the ideal teachers of history. For according to Butler, fortunate is the student "who is guided by the study of history through the gates that lead to literature. Herodotus and Thucydides, Livy and Tacitus, Gibbon and Macaulay, von Ranke and Mommsen, Laurent and Martin, are not only historians but men of letters. They reveal to the students of history the play, upon the records of the past, of high intellectual power, working with the instruments of the fine art of expression. The teacher of history who awakens in his pupils a love of the literature of history and a love of the literature that constitutes so large a part of the subject-matter of history, will not have taught in vain."[6]

VIEWS OF HISTORY AS GUIDE TO INTERPRETATION

First of all, let us freshen our minds on what history is. In its broadest sense, it is everything that ever happened. The idea of "history" as applied to any organized account of past events started with Herodotus who "inquired" wherever he went about things that seemed to him interesting or memorable.[7] He was a real investigator, a constant seeker after truth (which is not always attainable, he warns). But he was above all a story-teller, an artist in prose, and his work was made up of things that seemed to him interesting and likely to appeal to his public. What he wrote was story-telling history.

Severe standards of criticism and a different purpose appeared in the work of Thucydides. He aimed at something more than merely to preserve in pleasing form what was memorable, and even considered it very likely that his narrative would prove disappointing to the ear. He hoped that his work would teach political lessons, not because they presented as such, but because "a true picture" of political conditions and events would of itself convey political lessons. What he wrote was didactic history.

---

[6] See Nicholas Murray Butler's "Editor's Introduction," in *Teaching of History*, by Henry Johnson.

[7] Henry Johnson, *Teaching of History* (New York, 1949).

For about twenty-two hundred years, history remained essentially either story-telling history or didactic history. It was not until the nineteenth century that history of the scientific type came about. But this was preceded by a series of divergent views of history. The eighteenth century saw Gibbon, Macaulay, and many others, who viewed history as drama.[8] In fact Gibbon saw history as an exercise in irony, an endless register of the crimes, follies and misfortunes of mankind. It was the nineteenth century which brought history into its own.

The rise of nationalism gave people an urgent desire to articulate their sense of national identity, to trace their life to its roots, and to document the course by which their past gave birth to their present. The new romanticism replaced the eighteenth-century conception of the world as a machine. At the same time, it replaced Gibbonian detachment by a compulsion toward fervent commitment.

The romantic generation of historians were possessed by visions of history which organized their materials and controlled their interpretation. They sought themselves to become sharers in the drama they depicted. They chose their themes and designed their work with conscious artistry. And they were in intimate and sustained contact with their audience. But they were mostly not professional historians. They had other lives to live, and living them no doubt gave substance and energy to their history. Yet, even as they labored, their work was leading to the inevitable next stage. Ranke represented the link: he found history an art and left it a profession.

Many factors contributed to the process of professionalization. The steady secularization of the curriculum made history a subject. The vast enlargement of the raw materials of history made specialization a necessity. The improvement of historical technology deepened the shafts of research. And the application to historical research of a method assumed to be the method of the natural sciences gave history the attributes of a science. Eventually a new form of history, "technical history," was born. The sharpest difference between romantic history and technical history is the shift from narration to analysis. While Ranke started with a "what," Macaulay followed with a "how" when he said that history was the art of narration, and Michelet, a technical historian, with "why" for he insisted that the task was not to evoke, recreate, revivify the past, but to dissect it. The reconstruction of the past now seemed not a recovery of emotion but a reassessment of causation. The artist in history gave way to the artisan in history. Instead of being a sharer in the experience, the historian became a neutral observer. Instead of the partisanship, the passion, the black-and-white contrasts of the romantic schools, there appeared a miscellany of dry, detailed, dusty investigations, deliberately devoid of sentiment, of comment, and of grace. While the rise of analysis made possible a far more sophisticated account of historical causation, the decline of narrative carried history away from what Parkman had called "the life and spirit of the times." If the romantic historian had overdone drama to the neglect of more prosaic but more influential factors, the technical historian, by excluding drama, left a situation where one could know more but understand less. How, for example, could one hope to comprehend what brought about the Philippine Revolution if one denied validity to the emotions of the propagandists and Katipuneros and wrote as if inexplicable tantrums had pushed a "blundering generation" into a "needless war"?

---

[8] Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. "The Historian as Artist," *American Journal*, III, No. 4 (March 1964).

But if we are to listen to Nordau,[9] comprehension is unnecessary since nothing is knowable out of written history for it does not touch the realities of history. This imposes the capital penalty upon the field of history. This is disdain for history against which I must quote William V. Shannon in the press section of last month's *Reader's Digest*: ". . . To reject the past is to deprive today of its meaning tomorrow." Certainly, Shannon has simply put into words the scholarly attitude of the nineteenth century which saved history from utter neglect.

---

[9] Max Nordau, *The Interpretation of Hitsory* (London 1910).

The effect of the progressive separation of history from both art and experience was, in the end, to separate it from the intellectual community. History ceased to matter to the reading public. If the historian declined to meet the demand for an interpretation of public experience, then others had to fill the vacuum. The renunciation of the professionals has left the audience, on the one hand, to the non-professional historian and the historical novelist, and, on the other, to the journalistic pundit and the historical prophet. This situation posed as a grave threat to the historical profession. The threat of the first two of the "popularizers" of history could be reversed if the qualities and insight that they bring to history would stimulate the professionals to a livelier conception of the technical enterprise. Concerning the journalistic pundit, it is not the job of the historian to provide daily comment on history in the making, and it is his own fault if he fails to shape the thought of those who do. The gravest problem is the rise of the prophetic historian who has converted the genial visions of the romantic historian into dogmatic, comprehensive, universal, and tyrannical historical theories. This school has produced a Marx, a Spengler, a Toynbee—to mention a few of its giants. One thing common about them is that they are monists. Their faith is that they have reduced the chaos of history to a single order of explanation, which can infallibly penetrate the mysteries of the past and predict the developments of the future. While it must be admitted that the prophetic historian very often restores imagination and design to the writing of history yet, in the end he employs resources of art not to reconstruct the past but to charge his vision of the future with transcendent significance.

The challenge of the prophetic historian remains, and it will last so long as the technical historian refuses the great issues, refuses art, refuses imagination, refuses judgment, and refuses influence.

This is the current dilemma of historians. What can be done to revive the centrality of "rational history," to restore its connection with experience, to renew its ties with literature, and to reconquer its audience? There is no easy answer, but one must suggest that part of the answer lies in the historian's willingness to approach his task not only as a reseacher and analyzer but also as an artist.

THE PROCESS OF INTERPRETATION

What we have just done was an attempt to put in a nutshell the diverse views of history, if only to provide us with a frame of reference or a philosophy of history so essential to historiography. What is required now is a glance into the process of interpretation. First of all, let us recall that knowledge about history is learned from historical sources. The study of sources requires the historical method. It embraces two kinds of operations, criticism and synthesis. The body of related knowledge thus obtained implies selection of facts, grouping, generalization, organization. It is the last which is concerned with the interpretation of history.

Interpretation is the process by which the mind puts meaning or content into individual facts. In our field it is applied on individual facts in order to polarize them towards one of five fundamental institutions in history (government, church, school, occupation, and family). These institutions are also referred to as aspects of historical experience.[10] The external occurrences (facts or forum) are viewed as the sign of some internal movement of thought and feeling (content). To discover this movement through its sign, the event, is to interpret the latter. As a word is the sign of an idea, so is the act of a people the sign of their ideas and feelings. Hence, the events of history are a sort of language into and out of which we read a people's life.

The fact that the principles of a subject vary in degree of generality, and that the less general phases of institutional growth are phases of some more general movement, makes the process of interpretation possible for this class of historical facts. This form of interpretation may be illustrated in a brief manner by the following example. The idea of confederation in the establishment of a centralized government, the awareness of brotherhood stimulated through Christianization, the militancy among the natives who secured education due to the prosperity stimulated by the new policy of exploitation, the liberal atmosphere brought about by the Spanish Revolution, and the widespread indignation consequent to the Cavite Mutiny were only phases of the same great movement—the development of nationalism. For the mind to discover the identity of this general institutional idea with this large number of apparently isolated and particular phases, is to interpret them. The meaning of each particular phase is greatly enriched by discovering in it the sentiment of nationality. Other illustrations on a large scale may be found relevant to any of the fundamental institutions in history.

---

[10] Robert V. Daniels, *Studying History, How and Why* (New Jersey, 1966).

The process of interpretation aims to put the student into close and intimate contact with the people whose life he studies. To make events reflect that life, at least all the important phases of thought and sentiment in a given movement must be reached. It is absolutely essential to right interpretation that history be conceived as a process. Errors that may result from imagination can best be corrected by constantly tracing the influences and forces that produce the historical process. Such factors are labeled as causes. Since every fact in history is both cause and effect, it is imperative for interpretation to distinguish between positive and negative causes, fundamental and particular causes, causes and effects as against purpose and means, immediate and remote ends, as even to consider the ultimate end itself.

The values that may be derived from interpretation include unification of the facts of history (integration and unification), distinction between mechanical whole (aggregate of time and place) and organic whole (common idea, a principle not an aggregate), division or differentiation (means to more concrete interpretation), and development of historical judgment (ability to question appearances).

Aside from whatever educational values interpretation may have, allow me to close by citing some of its most valuable results in stimulating emotions and developing character. Firstly, the process of interpretation in history gives the rational bases for interest in the subject; secondly, the intimate contact with life of the past stimulates intelligent patriotism; and, last but not the least, a love of truth.

The Study of History: Emerging Trends and Possibilities for Philippine History *

Bonifacio S. Salamanca

THE TOPIC ASSIGNED to me practically covers all the lectures that follow mine, so I should at the outset clearly limit its scope. I am, therefore, adding a sub-title which will indicate its more limited scope, in the hope that in so doing I might be able to say something meaningful within a half-hour or so. At first, I thought of discussing Toynbee and McNeil's universal or holistic approach. An alternative option was to dwell on trends in historical study that are now being developed in the study of American political and social history.

I chose the alternative for I fear that the former properly belongs to the topic on "New Dimensions in Historical Studies." There is, of course, the possibility that my choice will impinge on Professor Lucero's assignment, "History as a Social Science." If this should be the case, we can always take comfort by falling back on the saying that two heads are better than one.

---

* Lecture delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the National Historical Commission and the Philippine Historical Association at San Carlos University, Cebu City, on Sept. 21, 1973.

Teachers of history in high schools and colleges, in an attempt to impress their students when they meet them for the first time, invariably belabor the point that, among others, the study of the past—history—performs two essential functions: it cultivates openmindedness and generates a liberal outlook. The study of history therefore is an important component of general education or liberal education.[1] It has been said, however, that historians have been the least openminded and are among the most illiberal when it comes to enriching the methodology of their discipline. They have been labelled as a "conservative-minded" fraternity,[2] because of their non-receptiveness to methodological innovations.

This charge, I am afraid, has some validity when applied to Filipino historians. At least that is the impression I got from a survey of the output of our colleagues in the PHA as well as of those who, for one reason or other, have forgotten to join this prestigious organization.

This fortunately need not shock us; even in countries where historical scholarship has had a longer history, there are still many whose persistence in adhering to the traditional methods of historical study is as solid as the Rock of Gibraltar.[3] In any case the movement to transform the methodology of history to that of the social sciences is comparatively recent in origin.

But new trends are emerging, and the younger generation of historians especially in the United States and France are most likely to pursue the creeping evolution in the study of history to earn for the discipline a secure place among the social sciences. To these and some of their forbears who dared make the one step beyond the traditional methods, it is not enough for history to be regarded as a social science simply because it shares a common denominator with the social sciences—the "study of the facts of man's social existence";[4] history they protest, must incorporate into its methodology some, if not all, of the facets of social science research.

---

[1] Cf. See for instance, Robert V. Daniels, Studying History. *How and Why* (2nd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, N. J. Prentice-Hall, 1972): Louis L. Gottschalk, *Understanding History: A Primer of Historical Method* (2nd ed., New York: Alfred Knopf. 1969), and Jacques Barzun and Henry F. Graff, *The Modern Researcher* (rev. ed., New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970).

[2] Stephen Thernstrom, "Quantitative Methods in History: Some Notes," in Seymour Martin Lipset and Richard Hofstadter, eds. *Sociology and History: Methods* (New York: Basic Books, 1968), p. 59.

[3] See, for instance, J. H. Hexter, "Some American Observations" in Walter Lacqueur and George L. Mosse, eds. *The New History: Trends in Historical Research and Writing Since World War II.* Harper Torchbooks, 1967, pp. 5-23.

It is my intention in this lecture to bring to your attention some of the new developments in historical research and analysis that are now being utilized particularly in the United States and France, and to indicate their possibilities to the study of Philippine political history.

Before discussing these, however, perhaps we should first take note of the earlier genres of historical study.

Th first was narrative history, dramatizing important or great causes, and was distinguished for its felicitous and elegant prose and sweeping style. Its practitioners were mostly well-educated amateurs or non-academicians, but who "had scholarly standards and methods defined by the cannons of accuracy and verification."[5]

Narrative history was followed, though not necessarily superseded, by a type of history developed by historians who were not only trained, but stayed on, in the universities, historians who sought to establish the study of history upon solid "scientific" foundations. These academic historians, whose main vehicle was the monograph, took special pride in multi-archival research, and developed what we call the "critical method" in historical research, or simply the historical method.

During the interwar period, the "new history" which James Harvey Robinson of Columbia University had started to preach even before World War I, became the fashion. This type of historical study was more broadly-based than the specialized, monographic studies of the Pre-World War I era in that it took into account the social and economic background of political events, embraced the activities of the common people as a legitimate subject matter of historical research—in sum, it was a sociological history. It was, however, minus the methodology of sociology. This is the type of historical study which the advocates of the new trends now propose to supplant with what Hofstadter has called "the new analytical history."

---

[4] Daniels, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

[5] Richard Hofstadter, "History and Sociology in the United States" in Seymour Martin Lipset and Richard Hofstadter, eds., *Sociology and History: Methods* (New York: Basic Books, 1968), p. 40. This section of my paper is based essentially on Hofstadter's article.

The new analytical history is characterized by massive borrowing from the methodology of the social sciences, especially sociology and social psychology. Its advocates employ a conceptual framework with which to order historical data and enable the researcher to develop a clearer focus of his problem. They apply generalizations and/or propositions derived from contemporary analysis in their examination of historical phenomenon and in their explanations of cause and effect where historical data are unavailable. Above all, the new analytical history advocates the use of quantitative data, as against qualitative evidence or data. Where they feel quantification is obviously necessary they resort to data analysis through the use of high-speed electronic computers. This has especially been employed in the study of American and French political and economic history.[6]

What are the possibilities of the emerging trends which I have briefly noted for the study of Philippine history?

Having acquired the rudiments of historical research from mentors steeped in the old tradition, and possessing what may not even pass for a smattering of the sociological approach to the study of history, I should be the last one to say that there are some. We will, however, never know its possibilities until and unless we attempt to imitate, perhaps even crudely, our counterparts abroad. The pursuit of knowledge, the search for truth, knows no national boundaries; if we ignore the new trends in the study of history we run the risk of surrendering the initiative in the application of such techniques to the study of our own history to foreigners. Sometime ago a distinguished member of the Department of History, U.P., advised his younger colleagues that the time has come for us to wrest the initiative from foreigners, particularly, Americans in the study of our history. That is how it should really be. It is not too late, and I think one pathway is the application of the emerging methodology to the study of certain aspects of our history to begin with.

---

[6] For a survey of the literature, see Lipset, *loc. cit.*, Thernstrom, *loc. cit.*; Allan G. Bogue, "United States: The 'New' Political History," in Lacqueur & Mosse, pp. 185-207; Francois Furet, "Quantitative History," in *Daedalus*, 1971, pp. 151-167.

Perhaps, we can start in the field of political history, more specifically, with the emergence of a Filipino nationality as a phase in the development of Philippine nationalism. The study of Philippine nationalism has, during the past half-century, yielded a prodigious amount of detailed, microscopic studies, starting with the late Professor Leandro H. Fernandez's "The Formation of Filipino Nationality" read during the 400th anniversary of the "discovery" of the Philippines by Magellan in 1921, the publication of Prof. Agoncillo's *The Revolt of the Masses* in 1956 to Father Schumacher's *Father Jose Burgos* and *The Propaganda,* published in 1972 and 1973, respectively.[7]

In these and in other works dealing with Filipino nationalism, we are told that a distinct Filipino national consciousness began to emerge sometime in the nineteenth century and that the execution of Fathers Jose Burgos, Mariano Gomez and Jacinto Zamora, as an aftermath of the Cavite Mutiny of 1972, marked a "turning point in the history of Filipino nationalism, (and was) a catalyst which brought together the liberal reformist elements in Philippine society with the growing self-awareness of a people into a movement frankly aimed at independent nationhood."[8]

Was this really the case, simply because it happens to be the consensus among students of Philippine nationalism? Did the inhabitants of the Philippine start thinking of themselves as a distinct people only in the nineteenth century? If indeed not earlier, when in the nineteenth century did they do so? Was it only after 1872?

---

[7] Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *The Revolt of the Masses, The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines 1956); John N. Schumacher, S.J., *Father Jose Burgos: Priest and Nationalist* (Quezon City: Ateneo University Press, 1972) and *The Propaganda Movement*: 1880-1895 (Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House, 1973).

[8] Schumacher, *Father Burgos,* p. 1. But see his, *The Propaganda,* which he writes (saw) the first faltering, and as yet not fully conscious, steps towards the creation of a nationalist movement.

A study of the Philippine nationalist movement anew employing quantification and using "symbol analysis" such as that devised by Richard L. Merritt in his study of American nationalism,[9] might yield answers to the questions I have raised.

By devising a theoretical framework for indentifying symbols of British identification and of American consciousness in selected newspapers in five population clusters in colonial America, from 1735 5to 1775, and quantifying the frequencies of such symbols in these newspapers, Merritt was able to show that, contrary to earlier views, "Americanism" started even before the War of Jenkins' Ear which began in 1739; "nor did the spirit of American nationalism strike the colonists like a bolt from the blue during the French and Indian War," as other students of American nationalism have earlier suggested.[10]

We could probably undertake an exercise along the line suggested by Merritt; if symbol analysis should confirm the consensus among our scholars, so be it; if not, then we should reconsider such a consensus.

Additionally, symbol analysis could also possibly help us pinpoint when the transition from assimilation to a demand for independence took place, or if it has been pinpointed, to fortify its historical foundation. We might also be able to resolve the debate among some of our historians on the relationship between the reform movement and the revolution of 1896. As we know, there are those who claim that the reform movement was not a positive factor behind the revolution of 1896 and that it may have even delayed its coming. There are others who pontificate that the reform movement was essential to the coming of the revolution in 1896, that is, the revolution was a natural consequence of the reform movement. A resolution of the opposing views or debate is obviously in order; since the use of the traditional methodology has apparently failed to accomplish it, perhaps the use of the new approach might.

---

[9] Richard L. Merritt, "The Emergence of American Nationality: A Quantitative Approach" in Lenset and Hofstadter, *op. cit.*, p. 138-158.

[10] Merrit, *loc. cit.*, pp. 138-158.

Social science methodology can also be employed in determining Filipino reception of American rule, specifically in locating the point in time when the Filipinos became reconciled to American sovereignty on a more or less dependable basis. I have, on the basis of my limited research in several archives in the United States, suggested that this took place sometime after the establishment of civil government in 1901 and the creation of the Philippine Assembly in 1907, and that, except for irreconcilables like Artemio Ricarte, here was no more turning back thereafter, especially after the inauguration of limited free trade relations in 1909.[11] But this, I qualified, was true only for the political and economic elite. Was this true also for the masses or the bulk of our people? Since the latter had no newspapers with which to communicate their views, symbol analysis obviously is out of the question. So is an opinion survey, since probably only a handful of the Filipinos who were old enough to realize what it meant to be under American rule in 1901-1909 are still living today, seventy years later. A knowledge of political behaviour in the Philippine setting, derived through contemporary analysis by sociologists and political scientists might give as an inkling of the masses' reception of American rule during the period in question. Fortunately we now have some propositions, such as that advanced by Dr. Agpalo,[12] to the effect that the Philippine political system had always operated as an organic whole, with the political elite's views and activities enjoying popular being support by the people.

---

[11] *The Filipino Reaction to American Rule,* 1901-1913 (Hamden, Conn.: The Shoe String Press, 1968).

[12] Remigio E. Agpalo, "The Organic-Hierarchical Paradigm and Politics in the Philippines." Paper Read at a Symposium on the Social Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences, University of the Philippines, September 15, 1973.

The Study and Teaching Of History: How to be a Historian or Historical Researcher*

Bonifacio S. Salamanca

THE DAY I receive the announcement that the Philippine Historical Association was going to sponsor this lecture series on "The Study and Teaching of History," I said to myself: this is one gathering of the Association I must not miss. As I have not attended almost all the past meetings, conferences, seminars and lecture series of the Association I also thought that this would be an opportune time to renew old friendships and establish new ones. For the subject of the lectures and discussions was very impressive: to hear all of them for ₱60.00, that would be a bargain! This initial reaction was anchored on a sincere desire on my part to learn more about my first love—history—and how to be a better historian and historical researcher.

But alas, it did not turn out to be that way, for some time later, word came from our perennial Executive Secretary, Jorge Revilla, that the Association was still shopping around for lecturers on the first two topics of this series. I indicated that if no one else in the UP history department was available, I would be willing to try the first lecture. To my surprise, I seem to have been the only one among my colleagues willing to talk on the subject: So, in a sense, I got hooked.

---

* Lecture delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the Philippine Historical Association at the Teachers' Camp, Baguio City, on March 30, 1973.

That is why instead of being with you in the audience now, I am right before you.

It is in this context that you must view my presence before you this afternoon. I am here not so much to tell you how to be a historian and/or historical researcher—only a gray-haired historian is qualified to do that, and I am not yet too old!—but rather to share with you the little that I know on the subject and my limited experience as a utilizer of Clio's weapons.

I can think of no better way to introduce my assignment than to ask these questions:

1. What is history?
2. Why do we study history? Does it serve a purpose?

I am aware that in posing these questions, I am likely to reopen a debate among us historians and especially between us and non-historians, a debate which is as old as the study of history itself. But the issue must be faced, even if only superficially, before we can deal with the problem of how to train a historian or historical researcher.

As practicing historians, you and I have had acquaintance with the various meanings of history. We know, for instance, that history has been invariably defined simply as the "past of mankind", as the study of the past or, as another has put it, the systematic and scientific study of the past. An English historian, after a discussion on the status of history as an autonomous discipline, has come up with this definition:

> History is concerned with all those human sayings, thoughts, deeds, and sufferings which occurred in the past and have left present deposit; and it deals with them from the point of view of happening, change, and the particular.[1]

I hope that you will find this definition all-embracing enough and, therefore, acceptable for our purpose.

---

[1] G. R. Elton, *The Practice of History* (London: The Fontana Library, 1969), p. 24.

Why do we study history? Man is a social animal with a sense of his past; this quality is what distinguishes him from the lower forms of animal life. It follows that for man to understand his past he has to study it. Like any other field of study, the study of the past can satisfy emotional needs; it can be entertaining as well as illuminating. Illuminating because like the other disciplines, history is the search for truth, that is, the truth about the past. Even if these were the only *raison d'etre* of history, they would be sufficient. But history has also practical uses: when confronted with a problem, a study of the history of that problem can be of tremendous help to the statesman. Indeed a knowledge of history not only gives solidity to an understanding of the present; it can even suggest guidelines for the future.[2]

Thus the study of the past can be a tool for the betterment of man's future, on the reasonable assumption that the totality of man's activities is geared towards his improvement.

Having disposed of these questions: what is history? and what it is for? — let me now proceed to my main task.

It is common to hear among college students—and I believe I can speak with some authority, having served as an academic adviser and being currently the dean of a growing college of the UP—that they would major "na lang" in history if they cannot hope to get into the natural sciences or in such social science disciplines as economics and political science. Their reason: it's easier because they need only three units of mathematics. To be a history major is, therefore, to follow the path of least resistance!

But is it? I think you know the answer. The study of the past, *qua* study of the past, is NOT an easy job. It is as demanding, if not more so, as any of the sciences dealing with man, even if the undergraduate curriculum in history does NOT entail taking so many courses in mathematics, the *bete noire* of most college students.

In fact, considering the way history has been prostituted to serve immoral and ulterior ends in the past, there is a greater need today for good historians, and a good historian is not produced overnight.

---

[2] Cf. Robert V. Daniels, *Studying History: How and Why* (2nd ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

It has been said of war that it is too important a business to be left alone to generals. This is not the case with the study of history: it is too important to be left to non-historians, quasi-historians and even to casual historians. The study of history had better be left alone to professional historians.

But how does one become a professional historian?

Although there is bound to be some disagreement on this, I believe that the first requirement is familiarity with the methods of historical research, which is best initially acquired through classroom instruction in college.

In my own survey of the history curricula of selected colleges and universities in the country I noticed that there is a semester's course on research methods, either in the social sciences in general or in history in particular. If such courses are taught the way the course in historiography is taught at the UP, then any bachelor's degree holder in history must have been introduced to at least one or two textbooks or manuals on historical research.[3]

Oftentimes, the course on research methods is handled by the most senior, if not the oldest, professor in the department; there is much that can be learned from such teachers beyond that contained in basic textbooks on research.

In addition to formal classroom instruction in research, under a professional historian and experienced researcher, one is compelled to read a few of the classics of historical writing or literature. For a historian must not only know how to undertake research—he must read good history books.

---

[3] The following is merely a random listing: CH. V Langlois and CH. Seignobos, *Introduction to the Study of History* (translated by G. G. Berry; London: Duckworth and Co., 1898); Sherman Kent, *Writing History* (New York, F. S. Crafts and Co., 1941); Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf 1953). (Also available in Vintage Edition, 1964); Homer C. Hockett, *The Critical Method in Historical Research and Writing* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1960); Wood Gray, *Historian's Handbook: A Key to the Writing and Study of History* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964); Louis Gottschalk, *Understanding History: A Primer of Historical Method* (2nd Ed., New York: Alfred Knopf, 1969); Jacques Barzun and Henry F. Graff, *The Modern Researcher* (rev. ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1970).

Pursuit of a college degree, then, is a better foundation for a historical researcher than self-study in the methods of historical research.

Formal training, while desirable, if not absolutely necessary; is just the first step. Important as it is in the preparation for historical research, in the long run it cannot be a substitute for what one acquires through actual research. To be blunt about it, the best way to become a historical researcher is to do research on a sustained basis. What one learns in the process is greater familiarity through trial and error.

I shall not go into the intrinsic value of research *per se*; I am viewing research here merely as a pathway to the historian's pedestal. For, as I have earlier said, one has to become a historical researcher first before he can merit the exalted title of historian.

How does one proceed to undertake historical research?

First of all, the researcher must have a topic or a subject of research. This topic must be one which is of interest to him, something that he is attracted to. The attractiveness of a subject, however, is but the first criterion in choosing a topic of research. The other criteria are:

1. The topic must be one in which the researcher is able to add to our existing knowledge about it; it will not do to simply put together what others have written on the subject. To find out whether, from this test, the topic is worth his efforts the researcher must have a general knowledge of the field or area of the research topic; how else would he know that there is a gap in our knowledge on the subject? This knowledge is acquired through sustained readings of known published works. To know what have been published about a subject systematically the researcher should make use of bibliographical aids. In using bibliographical aids, the rule is to start from the general to the particular, i.e., from the well-known American Historical Association's *Guide to Historical Literature*[4] to the *Bibliography of Asian Studies*,[5] then to a bibliography of South-

---

[4] Edited by George Frederick Howe and others, and published by the Macmillan Co., New York, 1961.

[5] Published annually by the Association of Asian Studies, U.S.A.

east Asian history and finally to a Philippine bibliography, if the subject is in the field of Philippine history.

Published bibliographies, however useful, are far from adequate since titles of unpublished works, to say nothing of ongoing research, are not included therein. For researchers in the United States and other advanced countries, they, fortunately, can refer to the triennial listings by the American Historical Association or similar listings.

2. The materials on a proposed research topic must be in a language or languages that the researcher has a reading knowledge of. As much as possible such materials must be readily available or, if outside his country, can easily be procured from abroad.

3. The topic must be manageable—neither too broad nor too narrow.

Having chosen a topic, the researcher proceeds to gather bibliographic data, *i.e.,* titles of works and sources of information most likely to be used. The researcher goes back to the bibliographies he has earlier consulted when choosing his topic—but this time, he writes down on 3 x 5 index cards the pertinent bibliographic data required, as prescribed by any of the standard textbooks on research. Consulting the card catalogues of major libraries may help but it is not as useful as consulting bibliographies, since card catalogues do not include articles in learned journals or periodicals. Books not available in the library are of course not catalogued. For manuscript collections, one has to rely on checklists or guides to archives; for the researcher in the United States, he can refer to Philip Hamer: *A Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States.*[6]

Having gathered his own bibliography the researcher proceeds with the next step—notetaking.

Notetaking is the most tedious stage of research, for this requires the utmost patience and perseverance, and lots of hardwork, especially when dealing with archival sources or materials.[7]

---

[6] New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1961.

[7] For a guide, see Philip C. Brooks, *Research in Archives: The Use of Unpublished Primary Sources* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969).

It is, of course, understood that the researcher must have already a working outline with some hypotheses to guide him in the process of taking notes. The outline must not be so detailed as to make the researcher a prisoner of it; it must not be too rough, either, as to make him flounder like a rudderless ship, with no direction or purpose.

These three mainly mechanical steps having been completed, the researcher now proceeds to criticize or evaluate his data or evidence in accordance with the canons of the historical method: this consists essentially of two parts: establishing their genuineness, or reliability, and assessing their credibility and significance.

We have heard of spurious and forged documents. They are found almost everywhere. The researcher must make sure that he is not unduly misled by such sources and evidence and thus naively and unwittingly become a party to their widespread acceptability. He must, therefore, at the outset develop an attitude of skepticism when confronting his sources or evidence, and must establish to the best of his ability that they are not spurious. He can, for this purpose, rely once again on the manuals of research and, if need be, call on the sciences auxiliary to history.

Sources of information vary in their reliability, that is some are more reliable than others. As a rule, primary sources are more reliable than secondary sources, and among primary sources, those that are contemporaneous to the events they describe have a higher degree of reliability than those composed long after, or even shortly after, the events have happened. Thus an eyewitness account, or a stenographic report, is more reliable than a diary or memoir. This is but one rule among several that one should be guided by in choosing which evidence or source should be relied on.[8]

Having ascertained the authenticity and degree of reliability of one's sources or evidence, the researcher undertakes next to establish their credibility, that is, the truth of a statement found in a reliable document.

---

[8] Any of the textbooks mentioned earlier deal more thoroughly on this matter.

A detail found in document must not be readily accepted; the researcher should doubt its credibility until he has proven otherwise. This is not to say that the researcher must be cynical or excessively doubtful, but he must not succumb to the common failing of accepting any particular or detail automatically.

I think I can illustrate this more clearly by citing my own experience.

In the early stage of my research on the American period in the Philippines, specifically on elite responses to certain American policies, I came across several documentary sources which suggested that the known position of the Philippine Assembly toward the Payne Bill of 1908 was open to question. That stand as recorded in the *Diario de Sessiones,* in the press at the time and in the memoirs or autobiographies of the men who were intimately associated with the issue, and which has gone down in our textbooks, is this: In 1908 the Filipino elite who controlled the Philippine Assembly vehemently opposed the Payne Bill, which provided for limited free trade between the Philippines and United States.

As I went more deeply in my research in the manuscript collections in the United States Library of Congress, Houghton Library of Harvard University (where the Forbes Collection is deposited), The Massachusetts Historical Society (Clarence Edwards Papers), Washington State Historical Society and Museum (James F. Smith Papers), the United States National Archives, etc., I came upon more evidence that started to convince me that this position of the Assembly did not represent the *truth* as to the Filipino elite's reaction to the Payne Bill. After carefully weighing the evidence, I resorted to a closer scrutiny of the motivations behind the public stand of the Assembly, their interests, and those of their constituents. I came out, in the end, with a conclusion that the Filipino elite welcomed free trade, the public stand to the contrary notwithstanding.[9]

I was aware that this conclusion, which ran counter to the prevailing view based on such evidence as the resolution of the Philippine Assembly, would be unpopular—I have yet to see it incorporated in textbooks—but I felt that my criticism of the evidence led me to no other conclusion. For as Elton has put it:[10]

---

[9] I have discussed this more fully in my article, "The Filipino Elites and The Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909," *The U. P. Research Digest,* VI (January, 1967), 2-18, and in my *The Filipino Reaction To American Rule,* 1901-1913 (Hamden, Conn.: The Shoe String Press, 1968), pp. 121-133.

> The historian must not go against the first condition of his calling: his knowledge of the past is governed by the evidence of that past, and that evidence must be criticized and interpreted by the canons of historical scholarship. New methods may improve his handling of that evidence, but they can do so only if they are controlled by the historical method, which grounds detail upon evidence and generalization upon detail.

Elton speaks of new methods of handling evidence, or of analyzing data, available to the historian.

Indeed, there have been during the past decade attempts to graft unto the traditional tools of the historical researcher the methodology of the behavioral sciences, such as conceptualization and quantification.[11] There is no doubt that some borrowing can sharpen the historian's analytical skills and handling of data, but it should not be at the expense of the historical method.[12]

After the spadework and the intellectual activity involved in analyzing his data, the researcher proceeds to the final stage of his endeavors: writing up his findings in readable form. This is not an easy undertaking for most, but it must be done, if he hopes to join the fraternity of historians. A historical researcher, after all, undertakes research with a view to enlightening or adding new knowledge about the past; it is his obligation to share such new knowledge with others. This he can accomplish on an enduring and widespread basis only through his writings.

---

[10] *Op. cit.*, p. 51.

[11] See, for instance, Robert F. Berkofer, Jr., *A Behavioral Approach to Historical Analysis* (New York: The Free Press, 1969); Edward Shorter, *The Historian and the Computer: A Practical Guide* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971): and Francois Furet, "Quantitative History," *Daedelus* (Winter, 1971), pp. 151-167.

[12] The dase for retention of traditional methods, with a minimum of borrowing from the behavioralists' techniques, is cogently argued by J. H. Hexter in "Some American Observations," *The New History: Trends in Historical Research and Writing Since World War II* (Harper Torchbooks, 1967), pp. 5-23. See also Jacques Barzun, "Clio: The Muse and Her Doctors," *American Historical Review, LXXVII* (February, 1972), 36-64.

There are no set of rules for the researcher on how to present his ideas and findings properly well; he can resort to description or narration, involving analysis. But he must keep in mind that there is such a thing as a sense of order: that events and happenings have causes or origins and that they produce certain effects.

In composing his monograph or book, the historian should bear in mind that his audience consists not only of his peers but also laymen. He should therefore try to avoid using terms or words which require an ordinary person to consult a dictionary most of the time.

What next for the historian? I think he should cap his career by teaching. He probably has no choice anyway; he has to earn his keep, and the most likely place for him is the school, college or university. If he goes elsewhere and completely abandons teaching, he is less likely to become a better historian. Teaching complements his work as a researcher; it is, after all, another method of communicating his ideas and findings. Teaching also compels the historian to keep abreast of new historical literature and to undertake further research. For teaching without fresh readings and research will soon degenerate into dull routine and most certainly fossilize the historian's knowledge. Finally, through teaching, the historian will be in the best position to instruct new apprentices in the historian's craft, thus assuring that the study of the past, after his own lifetime, will be in trained hands and minds.

The Teaching of History *

Gloria Martinez-Santos

THE PHILIPPINES today stands at the crossroad of survival. Problems have to be faced squarely and decisions have to be made boldly or prudently as the case might be. At this stage it is good to recall some of the statements made by Dr. Jose P. Rizal:

> In order to read the destiny of the people it is necessary to open the book of its past.
>
> — *The Philippines a Century Hence*
>
> In the *Noli Me Tangere* I began the sketch of the present state of our native land. The effect that my attempt produced pointed out to me, before proceeding to unfold the other successive pictures before your eyes, the necessity of first making known to you the past in order that you may be able to judge better the present and to measure the road traversed during three centuries.
>
> — *Historical Events of the Philippine Islands*, by Dr. Antonio de Morga, annotated by Dr. J. P. Rizal.

If our national leaders feel inadequate to map out the destiny of our people; if our people find it difficult to understand how best to contribute to national progress; and if our educators themselves who should give directions to both are often times lost in their discussions of what national policies should be, could we not attribute the greater portion of the blame to the failure of our teachers in history, since they have apparently failed to drive home the incidents of the past that could help us understand the present more clearly, so that in turn we may be able to plan out a better future without committing the errors of the past and falling into the same vicious trap of helplessness and dependency.

---

* Paper read in the First Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at the Bicol University, Legaspi City, on August 28, 1971.

The most important factor in the success of any educational program is the effectivity of the teaching-learning process. No matter how much money and energy is spent by the curriculum planners and textbook writers still much will have to depend upon the actual implementation and use of these devices which now becomes totally dependent on the learning-teaching situation.

This is true in the case of history and the Philippine situation. History as a part of social science is taught from grade three to college. It is an integral part of the curricular offering in any college course under the general education requirement. Yet it cannot be denied that few of those who emerged from our institutions of higher learning knew enough history to make them conversant about the subject. In a small study conducted by students of historiography in St. Mary's College, Quezon City, 98% of the respondents felt that history is the most important subject in the curriculum, but 95% said that they did not want the method used in teaching the subject. In a similar study, teachers in both the elementary and high school rated low in the understanding of Philippine history. Incidentally, respondents in both cases came from the big universities in the City of Manila. It is imperative that steps be taken towards the improvement of teaching history in all levels of the educational ladder so that the knowledge gleaned from it may help in orienting Philippine society towards the right direction.

In any learning-teaching situation, the most important points to consider would be the nature of the learner or student, the nature of the subject to be taught, and the preparation of the teacher. In history, the starting point of the teacher, if he is to teach the subject well, is to reflect on the nature of the facts of history. Three outstanding characteristics of the facts of history as differentiated from the facts of other subjects, such as geography or natural science, are the following:

1. The facts of history deal with past human activity, which, therefore, cannot be directly observed and inspected since these events are past and being human actions they have been propelled by intentions known only to the individual responsible for the action. The significance of the act can be explained only by a process of inference and can be apprehended only through the imaginative powers of the mind especially if the person involved can no longer be contacted. A clear example of this would be the event known in history as the tragic death of the Supremo. What actually caused General Emilio Aguinaldo to finally implement the death penalty after he had previously commuted the death sentence shall forever remain a subject of controversy regardless even of the explanation that had been made by General Aguinaldo himself. Such is the credibility gap between one mind and another.

2. The fact of history is studied by emphasizing its uniqueness and individuality rather than its general implications as in the case of the facts in science and mathematics where the general principle is briefly explained followed by a series of exercises applying said general principle. In history, every single fact must be thoroughly explained as unique in itself because of the danger of interpreting a similar incident based on a previous one which may in reality be entirely different. Example would be the discussion of a particular event in history such as the Cuban Civil War led by Castro. Great care must be observed by the teacher to point out clearly to the students that although the same circumstances may be found in another part of the world, say the Philippines, the event may not develop or produce the same result as in Cuba. In other words, the Cuban Civil War is unique in itself and has to be discussed for its own merits or demerits as the case may be. To discuss the American Civil War of 1860 as a background of the Cuban Civil War may be proper, but to identify one with the other would be a great mistake. In many cases the greatest danger of a history teacher is to generalize and thus presume that what had happened to one man or one country may actually happen

in the same manner to another man or country. The teacher should not lose sight of the fact that a mistake committed in history may result in a tragedy.

3. The facts of history cannot be easily produced for direct inspection by the students, so the teacher will have to depend upon language as his principal, if not his only, medium of communication. Here is where the teacher of history finds himself at the mercy of the degree of literacy of his students. Most often a competent teacher in history fails to drive his point home to his class because of the inability of the students concerned to understand the language of instruction. It is because of this characteristic of the facts in history that the use of audio-visual aids becomes a necessity. Since historical events are essentially of the past, securing these audio-visual aids becomes a problem. If one is to consider that the intentions, motives and purposes of the events that have occurred are really more important than the observable "action" that has taken place, the situation becomes more difficult to meet, History becomes an imaginative reconstruction of events fraught with the danger of making it highly subjective and unreliable. With the growing cynicism and skepticism of our young people, it is indeed a challenge to teach history well enough for it to be understood and remembered.

Having reflected on what the nature of history is and having acquired a clear grasp of how facts in history differ from those of other subject matter, the next important problem to face would be how to group these facts to shape them into a logical and coherent pattern, to avoid chaos and disorder. All types of groupings must be based on some degree of relationships. The most frequently used type of groupings in history are the following:

1. *Chronological Arrangement*: Here the facts of history are arranged according to the earliest event to be taken up followed by successive events that have occurred. A careless handling of this method of grouping facts may result in a monotonous method of teaching that will bore the students and lead to a strong dislike, if not permanent apathy, for the subject. One event followed by another in successive order may not necessarily show the distinct relationship that exists

between events, thereby defeating the purpose for which history is taught.

2. *Geographic Grouping*: Events happening within one's own country are grouped separately from those events which occurred in other countries. This type of grouping will have to show clearly how one event occurring in one's country may have an effect on either countries and vice-versa or it will result into a form of segmented teaching.

3. *Line of Development*: This type of grouping would put historical events leading to the development of a particular aspect of human activity together, such as the abolition of slavery in the United States as a part of the humanistic movement not only in the American continent but in Europe as well.

4. Another technique is to divide each period into topics for particular treatment such as the Propaganda Movement, the Awakening of the Indio, and others.

After getting a clear concept of the nature of the facts of history and how these facts are grouped together, the task of actually imparting these facts effectively to the students has to be faced. The teacher would do well to bear in mind the three fundamental principles of unity, coherence and proportion. To teach historical facts in a related sequence, in a manner that is clearly understandable, giving the necessary coverage to events according to their respective importance are the basic keys to successful teaching. Teaching history at its best would mean (1) giving students opportunities to express themselves concerning things they have read; (2) correcting wrong impressions wherever they exist; (3) helping pupils to master and to organize related historical facts; (4) giving additional information which the teacher has acquired through reading and travel; (5) the use of audio-visual materials to make abstract and general statements concrete and meaningful; (6) developing certain principles underlying the study of history such as the idea of individual and national worth and the means by which they have come about; (7) increasing the student's capacity for real happiness by making him fully aware of the permanent values in life; (8) helping the students increase their efficiency to become an active factor in bringing about social progress; (9) quickening his sympathies and moderating his judgment; and (10) inspiring students to better their efforts not only in history but in all phases of work in and out of school. To achieve this type of teaching, the teacher must be guided by well-formulated objectives and armed with different methods of teaching. To start with, the teacher of history must learn history, not simply memorize a litany of historical facts and names. He must like, if not love history, and be fully appreciative of true values which affect human life and human welfare. This attitude towards history would enable the teacher to convert his teaching from a mechanical process to a missionary effort conducted with missionary zeal. At this point, a teacher may well take stock of his assets according to the following check-list:

1. Ability to stimulate interest
2. Wealth of relevant comments
3. Attentive to students while reciting
4. Effective organization of subject matter
5. Well-developed assignment
6. Good use of illustrative materials
7. Provisions for individual differences
8. Effective method of evaluating the work of students
9. Freedom from disciplinary difficulties
10. Mastery of subject matter
11. Knowledge of the objectives not only of history but of education as a whole
12. Conversational manner in teaching to secure the interest of the students
13. Frequent use of the experiences of the students
14. Appreciative attitude manifested by nods, comments, smiles
15. Skill in asking questions
16. Definite directions for study
17. Skill in conducting drills
18. Willingness to experiment

Different methods of teaching may be used in the history class depending upon the grade level, the ability of the students to be taught, the resources available and other factors. These methods of teaching are as follows:

1. *Study Recitation*: This method should be preceeded by a carefully prepared assignment to enable the student to study the lesson. The teacher should be able to formulate a battery of questions that would make the subject matter not only in-

teresting but also vibrantly alive.

2. *Textbook Recitation*: Teachers using this method allow the students to open their books during the recitation period. The teacher challenges the students to explain and reason out rather than pick out mere facts from the text thus developing in the students the power of inference and the ability to reason and plan by thinking through and finding the reasons for the facts mentioned in the textbook. The disadvantage of using this method is the tendency of the students not to study their lessons ahead of time resulting in procrastination.

3. *Socialized Recitation*: There are two types of socialized recitation, formal and informal. In the formal type of socialized recitation, the students do all the work of the class according to parliamentary rules while in the informal type, the students and teacher talk and work together on the lesson at hand, using only the common forms of courtesy as guides in the discussion. The greatest advantage of using this method lies in developing the qualities of responsibility and leadership among the students. It also develops in them the ability to think and plan independently. However, this method has a tendency to be wasteful in terms of time and energy if not properly managed. There is the danger also of some active individuals to monopolize the whole recitation period.

4. *Individual Recitation*: The use of this method will enable the students to learn at their own particular rate depending on their personal ability. Since individuals differ in the manner of reacting to a given situation, this method will provide for various reactions to a given event. The teacher's part in this particular method of teaching is to serve as a guide, rendering assistance to every student who may require extra help and inspiring the fast learners to keep busy at thir work. Most of the work undertaken in this particular mode of teaching is done through writing which may degenerate into mere copying if the teacher is not vigilant enough.

5. *Group Activities*: This method of teaching is usually associated in class- or group-work projects or units of work selected for special study or development. It makes the learning-teaching situation more life-like by gathering data from actual experiences, organizing facts, arriving at conclusions,

and making recommendations if necessary. One of the most commonly used group activity is the educational field trip to historical spots such as a pilgrimage to the Dambana ng Kagitingan and the Calamba Shrine. For group activities to succeed, a well-planned lesson must be prepared ahead of time. In using the group activity method, care must be taken that the slow learners are not neglected for they are the type of students who may miss the real objective of the lesson.

6. *Problem Method*: Since history consists of the reactions of the human race as a whole, as a group, or as individuals to problems after problems, this method of teaching is most appropriate in a history class. The important thing to observe in this particular method of teaching would be the selection of the problem and the clear statement of it once chosen. The organization of facts that would lead to the solution of the problem at hand results in developing in the students deep awareness of the point to be learned, while teaching them logical thinking and meaningful search for data. The weakness of this method may spring from the inability of the students to see the actual relationships that may require more mature minds to evaluate.

7. *Project Method*: This method is very similar to the problem method except that physical activity and the use of concrete materials are necessary to carry out the plan of the day. The idea behind the use of this method is to keep the student learning history while he engages in constructive activities related to his history subject matter and at the same time he works towards a definite goal known only to him. If not carefully supervised, the project method may result in the preparation of things that have no connections to the history lesson at hand and may therefore, be simply a waste of money, energy, and time. It is extremely necessary that a criteria of evaluating the projects when finished should be carefully prepared and discussed even before the student is allowed to begin the project. Much frustrations have been experienced by students because the valuative criteria was not made available to them beforehand. Needless to say, vigilance on the part of the teacher during the preparation of the project will discourage the student from relying on other people to do the work for him.

8. *Unit Method*: The unit method may be planned for one month as the case might be. An outline is prepared containing not only problems to be taken within the unit, the particular objectives for each topic, but also the list of reference materials that may be consulted from time to time. The objectives for each unit must consist of both the general as well as the specific goals which may be achieved at a particular time alloted period.

9. *Lecture Method*: It is necessary at times for the teacher of history to explain the complicated events in history by means of a lecture. In giving the lecture, care must be used in the selection of words so that the lecture may be fully understood. The use of audio-visual materials must be resorted to relieve the monotony of the subject and help in making the subject matter more coherent. From time to time, questions may be entertained by the lecturer to clarify the doubts that may be in the minds of the students. In fact, it would be very helpful if the lecturer take the initiative in encouraging the students to ask questions in the course of the lecture.

No matter what particular method is finally chosen by the teacher, in the final analysis what would really determine the success of the teaching process would be the attitude both of the teacher and the learner. History is the subject that one should teach and study with enjoyment, as something fascinating; with discernment, as something profound; with reverence, as something bequeathed the race in sacred trust; with intense earnestness as something vital to the walfare of society. It should waken in the student the desire to acquaint himself with the facts that are common knowledge and add to the store by every possible discovery. Let it be part of his business to preserve what is in danger of being lost, as well as to the unearth facts that are still hidden from common knowledge. To accomplish these tasks, the teacher of history should be a votary of truth. He must strive with all his might to reach as objectively as possible, avoiding subjectivity to his own personal prejudices on certain facts of history. It is timely at this stage to keep in mind what a famous poet once said:

"Cursed be the social wants that sin against the

strength of youth!
Cursed be the social lies that warp us from the
living truth!"

The Teaching of History: Preparation, Methods and Techniques*

Luis C. Dery

IN THIS LECTURE I chose to emphasize one method of teaching only which, to me, is the most crucial of all methods—the teacher himself.

Methods and/or techniques in some sense may be interchanged and they could be boiled down to refer to ways or means with which to teach the prepared learning materials to the learners. Preparation is but the organization of the learning materials to be taught.

Every start of each academic year or semester, each of us teachers start all over again to teach the subjects we are handling to another group of students. Often we ponder: Should I follow the same approach as I have used last year. Or, should I revise things this time? Usually at this juncture, some of us experience boredom, if not resignation, whenever the school year opening is around since it means performing the same old routine teaching work. To those teachers meeting such boredom in their teaching tasks they need personal re-examination.

Often, whenever one teaches history inevitably he is confronted with the question *What* of history is he going to teach, knowing well that history is a record of the past thousands of years including the accumulating records of the vast changes rapidly occurring around us now; that as a teacher he is expected to teach these things, as in high school within 40 minutes five-time-a-week or in college one hour three-times-a-week; that his students are "forced" to take the subject and desirous to "finish" it as early as possible, etc. Confronted with these conditions, the teacher of history is further expected to cram within the limited allotted time for him to teach this subject even in capsule form during each academic year. Moreover, he is faced with the task of making the past alive if not interesting to his students, some of them with their interests apparently extinguished by other teachers already; or of introducing his students to the discipline of history.

---

* Lecture delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the Philippine Historical Association at the Teachers' Camp, Baguio City, March 30, 1973.

Faced with such challenges, either some teachers after comprehending them took the path of least resistance by simply repeating what is stated in the textbook. It is with deep regrets that not only myself but also many thousands of students have been victims several times of such teachers who have deprived us of the golden opportunities of appreciating the challenges and potentialities of history.

But there are also those teachers of history who strive to make the most out of the limited alloted time for him to teach the subject. Some, in fact, try to teach history by emphasizing that learning becomes more or less artificial when rigidly confined within the four walls of the classroom, and allow their students to be confronted with the sources of history in their realities. These latter kind of teachers teach history not for answers or "lessons" nor simply narrate them according to the textbook, but also really teach history with the aim of enriching the students' understanding of human behaviour.

Obviously, as a subject, history has been taught in this manner year in and year out. Apparently, there is a meager result realized from its teaching as could be viewed from the very attitude that many students have regarded the subject as boring and dull. This was one of the results from the way history has been taught, that is, by simply following the textbook having in mind that after all the textbook was written by an experienced and authoritative person, ergo his book is (*sic*) authoritative. Many teachers, relying solely on the textbook, misconstrued this learning aid as providing a complete (*sic*) picture of the subject. Such thing is pure and simple stupidity, to quote Professor Teodoro Agoncillo in his lecture in one of the Philippine Historical Association's conferences last year. In other words, it should be realized by us that "history is what historians write about the past and that there is no one history but in essence there are as many histories as there were historians..."[1] This simply means that the historians' analysis and interpretations differ according to their own beliefs, biases, and skills. Such differing interpretations could be used by the teacher in teaching history to his students through acquainting his students with such varying interpretations. In this manner the teacher could help his students conduct their own studies of history.

I personally believe that those who teach history according to what the textbook says do not teach history at all. What they are doing is merely to teach a second-hand version of history, as interpreted by the textbook writer. Furthermore, the teaching of history is rendered useless and unmeaningful if the emphasis is simply imparting facts, dates, events and names. Viewed from another angle, this manner of teaching history simply means "covering" it. To use this "covering" approach is to hide history before the students. and the results would be tragic because if we merely cover the subject matter we are actually closing it from our students. Surely, to close the subject is unfortunate for this could lead to a negation of the aims of teaching history in our schools. I would rather say that instead of "covering" history, let us open its sources and materials for scrutiny and analysis. Through this history could be rendered meaningful to the learners.

From the above-mentioned matters it is clear that I have not discussed any methods or methods in teaching history and how to prepare what to teach in history, except the one about the teacher. I would like to say that the best method, and corrollary to this, the lousiest method if he wants to, is still the teacher himself.

---

[1] Mark M. Krug, et al., *The Social Studies: Analysis of Theory and Materials* (Itasca, Illinois, F. E. Peacock, 1970).

Many of us have read and studied some, if not many methods, of teaching a subject or how to prepare teaching materials, but we should understand that these things were also products of the experiences and researches of their authors with the intention of sharing them with us. No matter how much we try to use such methods and/or techniques created by others there is still no substitute to a lively, inspiring, and interested teacher desirous to learn and create his own methods of teaching and guiding his students in the study of history. There is still no substitute to the methods of teaching that you, as a teacher of history, have created out of your own experiences, experiments, successes or failures. I am advocating therefore, that each of us should avoid copying others' methods, but strive to create his own methods or techniques of teaching.

Since you will be using your own methods of teaching, you can therefore prescribe the conditions favoring learning in the subject you are teaching, taking into consideration your own resources, the pupil's, and that of the community's expectations. Personal researches and experiences would help in enriching your knowledge and your sincere desire for self-improvement.

To me, the best method is still an honest teacher sincere in his purposes in why he is teaching and showing such sincerity through performance and concrete actions; an inquiring and inspiring teacher who organizes, guides, and directs and learns together with his students in the study of history.

One could enumerate methods and techniques in teaching history. But it is still the teacher who holds the key to their successful implementation and utilization, being the most qualified person inside the classroom. As to what methods or techniques to adopt in teaching history, the important thing is that "the teacher should decide which to adopt and then to see to it that his teaching is fitted to his conception of the subject."[2] In this sense I have viewed the teacher as the most crucial method, though I am not disregarding the values of the other methods and techniques of teaching. He is the single important factor that could either encourage or blunt the growth and cultivation of the students' interests in the study of history. To me, more or less, it is a vital role for teachers to exemplify what they are attempting to teach to their students. The following quotation would clarify my point:[3]

---

[2] W. H. Burston, *Principles of History Teaching* (Gt. Britain, Methuen, 1963).

> Have we tried to develop in ourselves the very traits of character or behaviour that we want to develop in our students? Do we realize that our teaching is not confined within the four walls of the classroom but includes the outside world as well, and that the effectiveness of our teaching is ultimately measured by how our students and ourselves participate in this bigger arena? . . .

Indeed, the methodological role of the teacher is crucial because:[4]

> No artificial device can serve as a substitute for the interested and well-informed teacher who is sensitive for opportunities for training his class . . . Nurtured by a favorable climate and by a community that tolerates differences of opinions, teacher and students can engage in the analysis and reflection which lead to understanding and insight . . .

As to whether how successful the teacher will be in utilizing himself as a method could be seen no less by himself by the very way, the very manner his students reacts towards him.

I need not elaborate more on the ways and means on how we teachers of history could serve as *the* crucial method because I think, for those teachers really desirous to improve themselves, they do not need to be told to improve themselves. If they really want to grow and learn too, and not merely vegetate, they would not content themselves in making the learning process a one-way affair, that is. that all informations emanate from the teacher and his students imply waiting to be spoonfed. Honestly, I would suggest that we don't need history courses but history sources to enable us teachers of history to confront ourselves and our students with historical sources and materials. Learning in history could be lasting if and when the students are brought directly with the realities of what they are studying about. And to those wanting to teach history meaningfully, he must not only have a knowledge of this discipline, but also he must have an honest belief in its importance, and a strong desire to communicate what it means to him and to other people.[5]

---

[3] Guillermo R. Lazaro, "The Teaching of Social Studies", *Phil. Journal of Education*, v. 46 (March 1968), p. 653.

[4] Isidore Starr, "The Nature of Critical Thinking and Its Application in the Social Studies", in Helen McCracken, *Skill Development in Social Studies* (Washington, D. C., National Council for the Social Studies, 33rd Yearbook, 1963).

Lastly, knowing that what I have lectured here are some ideas, I believe that in order to realize them let us not just talk about them. Let us not just talk about methods and techniques of teaching of history, or about history itself. It is unfortunate to note, in parting, that some if not many Filipinos are apparently talkative but lacking in performance. To me, performance speaks louder than words. If you won't mind, I would like to end my lecture by quoting in substance, the statement of the leading lady in the movie *My Fair Lady* when she told one of her suitors not to talk about love but to show it.

---

[5] Earl R. Beck, *On Teaching History in Colleges and Universities* (Tallahassee, Florida State University, 1966).

New Trends in Teaching History*

Milagros C. Guerrero

How many teachers of history, when given the opportunity to expound on their chosen discipline, have begun by making some such statement that historians of this generation have "A special obligation and a unique opportunity" in widening man's understanding of the world and his place in it? And yet, how many non-historians and critics of history tend to be cynical about the role of history, having assumed that history is nothing more than an inutile chronicle of names and dates, and are more appreciative of other disciplines that deal with contemporary human developments. How many students take history so lightheartedly that their whole reaction may be summarized in this remark: "History (perhaps referring to World History) begins with Genesis and ends with the final examination." It must be borne in mind, however, that these attitudes are undoubtedly brought about by the mistaken notion that nothing is important unless it is contemporary. The teacher of history must not be saddened by this view for the study of history will continue to be of utmost value for man's understanding of the huge sprawling panorama of his development.

Even so, there are very important reasons which compel teachers of history to make a fresh appraisal of the purpose and method of teaching history today. Teachers of this generation are increasingly meeting problems much more difficult than those which confronted earlier generations. They also face challenges and increased responsibilities in a nation beset by seemingly insurmountable problems and in a world undergoing rapid changes. There is, morever, an increasing competition from other disciplines which constrains the teacher of history to justify the existence of his profession and improve his techniques of pedagogy. And in a world undergoing profound changes, the justification of history teaching lies, to a very great extent, in what the teacher decides to do. While it is true that we teachers of history feel that we are being asked to do the impossible (and quite frankly, some history teachers unflinchingly assert that they do that very well) we must exercise great care and undergo rigorous training to be able to select and teach a particular subject matter from an increasingly wider and more problematic field. This problem confronts not only those who teach specific national or area histories but especially those who handle world civilizations. Closer home, the way Philippine history is presented and interpreted is of vital importance, since the teaching of history underlies the most dynamic ideological force at work today which is none other than nationalism.

---

* Paper read in the Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at Silliman University, Dumaguete City, on January 22, 1972.

Given the time limitations of this seminar, we cannot suggest a new history curriculum, program, theory or even a perspective. I like to think that the basic aim of this short talk is to give insights into recent trends in history teaching, here in the Philippines and elsewhere and to indicate the problems and possibilities in teaching history in our country. This lecture was prepared under the firm belief that by "teaching history" is meant history "for use" rather than history "for its own sake."

At the outset it is possible to make some assertions on the important place of history in education and the responsibilities of teachers of history in preserving that place in education. We could begin by pointing out that essentially, history is an imaginative study in a reconstruction of the past now long gone and therefore could not be studied and scrutinized directly. In the process of studying it, we somehow live in imagination of some past age. If we adopt this view, then we stand to benefit by acquiring a sense of values between different aspects of life in any given age. Students will be provided a special opportunity for exercising in judgment in considering how, for example, economic factors bore on politics, how customs and traditions encroached on state affairs and finding out which of these were eventually more important. The same approach would also provide the student of history the experience of synthesis of those aspects of life normally dealt with separately by various disciplines in the social sciences and the humanities. By a reconstruction of the past we can view our present development and see the place of any society in history, distinguish what was merely ephemeral and was enduring, what events were insignificant at a given time but subsequently were to affect many generations.

The benefits that we can get from the study of the past becomes doubly important if we ponder upon the fact that we are denied a horizontal perspective of our history by our being participants in its making as well as a vertical perspective of it (i.e., that part of it which relates to the future). This consideration should convince us that history has every reason to form an important cog in liberal education. A careful study of the past prompts us to ask penetrating questions of the present, enables us to discern the real differences between it and the present, thus deepening our understanding of our own times. In this sense, too, we are studying and teaching history not only for its own sake.

The second educational benefit peculiar to the study of history comes from balancing the horizontal against the vertical perspective, which consists of seeing an age, first in its own right, and then against what came before and what came after it. This problem of achieving equilibrium in considering the past, present and future is always with us. And for our profit, history, properly studied or taught, gives constant illustration of how different generations have viewed their duties and responsibilities to our society.

The third educational benefit that we can get from the study of history comes from its synthesizing peculiarity. It involves not only the scrutiny of political, economic and religious aspects of the life of the past but also the scientific developments, literature and the arts. In this way history could be used as the basis of a school curriculum that would weave together the various subjects, which in process might contribute greatly towards breaking down subject barriers and overspecialization.

These gains, however, can only come from a mature and correct study of history. It need not be stressed here that history is important not as something important in itself but for what it leads to. Over the past decade teachers of history all over the world have developed techniques and devices which have made history more alive, more real and useful to student and teacher alike. How they are employed must, of course, depend upon the indivinual teacher and upon his conception of his aim and purpose in teaching history. It must be emphasized here that inadequate, inefficient and boring instruction in history might in the long run result in individuals, who, finding no pleasure and profit from his studies, become completely indifferent, apathetic and worse antagonistic to the study of history.

At this point, perhaps an appropriate precautionary note should be clearly made before citing these devices and techniques which no doubt would help improve the teaching of history, particularly in the Philippine area. The following words should in no sense be regarded as overly critical of our teachers of history who undeniably work under the most adverse and trying circumstances, nor are they meant to imply that the methods cited here are far more superior than any currently being used by these teachers. They are impelled by the desire that many more students should have the privilege of being guided and taught by uniquely trained and adequately prepared teachers of history.

A CRITICAL VIEW OF CURRENT INSTRUCTIONAL METHOD

1. From all available data, a distinguishing feature of much contemporary Philippine history instruction in the high school and, worse, even in colleges and universities is the emphasis placed upon an omnipresent, usually well-organized, stand-

ard textbook that functions as "the all important link" between the teacher and the student. The textbook becomes the course of study, the only authority, though more often than not, it is always a bit outdated by the latest developments and interpretative approaches in history. Many say, and not without reason, that the textbook provides but a limited view, in truth nothing but "a crutch," but there is no denying the fact that many teachers find a single history textbook the most useful tool in their profession. We need not stress the fact that this aspect of instruction in history is almost pathetic, considering that better updated textbook editions are well nigh impossible and certainly out of reach by many of the nation's studentry because of the present financial situation.

2. Traditional instruction favors the chronological emphasis in the study of history, where events are studied from the earliest sources to the most contemporary circumstances. This is certainly a great burden to many teachers of history who are expected to cover the broad expanse of historical development in the Philippines within a full academic year or semester. This is as true of "world history" or "world civilizations." Seldom has attention turned to organizing history, whether Philippine or any other history course, into units, themes and cohesive topics. Philippine history, for example, is viewed essentially through the binoculars of successive gubernatorial regimes during the Spanish and American periods or presidential administrations in the present Republic. Teachers rarely resort to the "microscope" approach for greater depth and almost never use the "telescope" method that requires distillation, comprehension and abstraction of long periods of historical development.

3. While conscious of the greater objectives of historical study, many teachers continue to cling tenaciously to memorization of dates, names, sequences, statistics as well as obscure details. These teachers are more concerned with the immediate need of granting a series of academic grades and the long range goals are usually forgotten. Thus so much attention is given to the details of the Legazpi expedition with little subsequent importance given on the impact that the voyage of 1570 had on the Filipino pre-colonial world. Thus, considerable at-

tention is given to the independence missions that went to the United States during the 1920s and the 1930s and their activities there, but hardly any time is spent to look into their significance and relevance or lack of it.

4. One of the most serious criticisms of instruction in history is the selectivity and timidity with which past events are handled. It is quite easy to note the beneficent results of Spanish and American colonial rules in the Philippines because evidences do abound to support some such conclusions. It is quite another matter when students are instructed on the ruthless exploitation of the masses with the institution of forced labor, the *encomienda* system and other colonial practices; when students must trace the continuity of one aspect of life in Philippine society, like perhaps feudalism from its beginnings in the Spanish regime to its condition in contemporary times. One criticism then of instruction in Philippine history is the habit of avoiding controversies, soft pedaling or de-emphasizing certain aspects of our history that might excite controversy. It is high time that in the social studies and in Philippine history, in particular, the need for academically treating pertinent controversial issues is recognized and faced.

5. Too much emphasis is placed upon political development while other aspects of social development are neglected. The history of the Philippines is approached generally by tracing the shifting fortunes of colonial powers, though a pause is usually made to enable the students to scrutinize the awakening of the Filipinos to the political realities of the 19th century and the Revolution of 1896. Instruction is rarely broadened to examine social institutions other than the government and the key personalities associated with it. A society, after all, possesses aspects other than political, but many teachers hesitate to enlarge upon them. Economic conditions, for example, receive very little attention, despite recognition of its close association with political developments. The history of trade, of agricultural development, of foreign communities in the country, of the Church at various stages of Philippine history become mere vague backdrops before which the main political events took place.

A part of the remedy would require broader preparation in a variety of disciplines, but particularly in such social sciences as Geography, Anthropology, Sociology and Economics. If teachers of history must justify their role in liberal education, they cannot afford to neglect the steady growth of these specialized fields. Questions like: what factors contributed to the development of a native intelligentsia class, which later on would spearhead the propaganda-reformist movement of the 1880's?; what was the nature of foreign trade with the Philippines and its role in social changes?—can be answered adequately as history teachers are better grounded in associated disciplines in the social sciences than they actually are at present.

6. The difficult problem of seeking both quantity and quality always plague the history teacher—the problem of whether to opt for the quick memorization of quickly forgotten trivia and sweeping coverage of the "fact," or to come to grips with selected historical themes or periods so that the student acquires a more than speaking acquaintance with one specific point in history. The latter, it need not be stressed, is particularly useful to teachers of Philippine history where many documents for certain specific events are readily available to us. Pertinent and comprehensive source materials may be carefully assessed before the students can reach conclusions by themselves.

Teachers of history, however, are fortunate to have at their disposal a variety of methods, devices and procedures which could help develop the quality of instruction not only in Philippine history but in area histories (e.g., Southeast Asian History, Japanese History, Western Europe) as well, if they take care to spend the extra time and effort to draw upon presently available resources.

SOME RECENT TRENDS IN TEACHING HISTORY

The practical or theoretical remedies for whatever defects history teaching is suffering from range from modest suggestions to broad sweeping ideas which would effectively improve the quality and orientation of instruction. Some represent minor innovations which will serve regional school needs. Others are more ambitious in terms of expenditures, cooperation and energy investments which probably would entail the encouragement and help of the National Historical Commission. Still others constitute more drastic changes upon Philippine history teaching to bring vigor to this area which it has not experienced before. All these devices share in common the impetus of their proponents who have experimented with them in many parts of the world over the past decade and found them helpful.

1. The conscientious teacher of history, whether he be teaching in high school or in college, is certainly aware that there is no compelling need to rely upon the prescribed textbook. He may and he, in fact, should draw up a syllabus that could best guide the students to a much improved study of history. A syllabus is a statement of the contents of a subject which it is proposed to study; it is also a statement of the order in which the contents may be studied. The teacher may combine the chronological, developmental and era method approaches to the study of history in the syllabus if he desires to make the students aware of the differing characteristic of life in the main historical periods which he constructs as well as to encounter a number of great figures of history.

Admittedly, the problem of getting away from a single standardized text is no small matter. The history teacher in a small school with a limited library or worse, in a school without a library (and there are many!) should of course continue to service existing history courses with the prescribed textbooks as usual and as best they can. But there is much that history teachers can do to reduce overdependence upon a single text. The answer lies in recourse that should be taken to available primary documents or secondary sources that best reflect the lessons, aspects or details of history that need to be emphasized. The textbook, of course, could still be the main source of information and should always be "a useful adjunct of the teacher and a reassurance to the pupil." But other course, especially documents and primary materials can even better cultivate our understanding of our heritage and of world civilization as well.

Ever clutching at a "pedagogical straw," let me suggest that great value may accrue from serious use of primary sources as adjuncts to the textbook. For example, the French correspondent's Edmond Plauchut's account (or excerpts from it) about the Cavite Mutiny of 1872 can make the student understand the political and other far-reaching implications of the execution of the three martyred priests Gomez-Burgos-Zamora better than the usual standard textbook interpretation. It would also be instructive to take into consideration other teaching aids, such as biographies and historical fiction. The biography is useful because it illustrates so many themes it is almost an informing history in itself. Because history first and last is about people, what they do and what happens to them, no matter how close the attention of the class to events, institutions and ideas, the teacher of history must come back to the men who performed the deeds, ran and helped evolve these institutions and conceived the ideas. Thus no study of the Commonwealth period of the Philippines is complete without a consideration of Manuel Quezon, his life, his loves and hates, his public and confidential dealings with Filipino political leaders and American policy makers, which after all had a lot to do with the fate and fortunes of the transition period of the 30's. An excerpt or two from the almost biographical *Between Two Empires* of Theodore Friend or Carlos Quirino's anecdotal *Quezon; Paladin of Philippine Freedom* would be most profitable. Another approach that offers possibilities at both secondary and lower grade levels would be the use of historical fiction which unfortunately is not well developed in the Philippines. But assuming that the class is studying cultural development under Spain, a reading of the chapter on "The Class in Physics" in Jose Rizal's *Noli Me Tangere* would be more enlightening to the student interested in understanding the state of education under Spain.

2. One method, perhaps not as yet popular in the Philippines, is the cultural approach to the study of history. It could be used in combination with the chronological developmental and era approaches. Like the political approach, it considers history as an instrument of regional and national significance, loyalties, allegiances and patriotic attachments, indeed a tool for self-identity. Because the cultural approach involves looking into the history of the mind and character of the people, of the major ideas which appeared to dominate the society or an era, of the institutions with which we associate the conduct and faith of our ancestors, it is popularly regarded as an im-

portant tool for understanding cultural developments of the present. Probably no other form of approach to the study of history makes greater demands upon the teacher of history; probably none is more fascinating when these demands are satisfied. The requirements of teaching history from the cultural vantage point are not satisfied—as some indifferent teachers appear to suppose—by a naked record, viewed chronologically, of what was written, painted, composed or built by a society during a particular era, e.g., culture during those years when Voltaire, Rousseau and the *philosopes* expounded on their ideas, when Mozart and Beethoven composed their immortal sonatas, or when Goya, Vermeer and Chardin painted their great canvasses. These enumerations are all for nought unless the teacher of history knows, understands, and could explain the ideas and interests of the entire generation responsible for these achievements and trace their manifestations in the fabric of societies other than that which cradled these great men. You can tell the story of the Propaganda-Reformist Period in our country in wholly isolated terms, by citing the *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo*; the activities of the expatriates in Spain, particularly Rizal, Lopez-Jaena and del Pilar; their demands for reforms and peaceful change, but you cannot do justice to that era without bringing in the impact of accelerated foreign trade in the 1850s upon the nascent middle class whose most articulate representatives were the reformists, the impact of liberalism in Europe upon these people and other sectors of Philippine society as well. If we were to discuss the anti-American resistance of Filipino writers during the first decade of the American regime (1900-1910), it is not enough that we cite the "seditious plays" that they wrote, the scathing editorials that were published, but we must also show how the socialistic works of Karl Marx, Bakunin, Fourier, Zóla, and Spencer, however vaguely understood, influenced their style and orientation. From these examples, it is clear that the teacher of history who would use the cultural approach is required to acquire a decent familiarity with the history of, and cultural developments in, many countries; to be familiar with the philosophy, literature and arts; and to be wise enough to synthesize them as necessity arises. This is rather difficult, especially for many so used to the more popular political approach. Indeed, the political approach seems to have a certain simplicity and clarity of outline and clear chronological development while the cultural approach seems to be distracted and amorphous.

3. Yet another approach that could be used, one that is increasingly popular among students of history in developing countries, is the dialectical-materialist approach—a method of teaching history (and other social sciences) that stems from historical materialism, a theory of social development as originally profounded by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. The Marxist teacher of history would argue the idea that it is the modes of production and the social relations to which they give rise that determine the consciousness of men, the ideological superstructure of society. In other words, economic relationships are singled out from numerous social relations as the essentially decisive factors in socio-economic formation, the last being also a fundamental concept of historical materialism. Socio-economic formation is the sum total of social phenomena of processes (e.g., the economy, ideology, way of life, religion, etc.). Society develops as one socio-economic formation is succeeded by another, naturally more improved and sophisticated. Thus the Marxist student of history would hold that history has progressed from the primitive communal formation to the slave formation, from the slave to the feudal to the capitalist and eventually to communism, the zenith of social development. Corollary to this assertion is the belief that politics and the political structure of society is a mere facade behind which the real forces—the economic factors—operated.

Thus, it may be observed that teachers of political history who adhere to the Marxist interpretation of social development will not teach purely political history, but political history immersed within a considerable amount of economic background. It is clear that in the face of this approach, the teacher would recognize a glaring need to study economic history. But, as in the cultural approach, we canont pressume that all other factors may be subsumed into the economic factors; that political history or cultural history has ceased to be important. On the contrary, if the teacher must prove the Marxist theory of historical development (i.e., that political institutions and cultural development are merely the instruments of more powerful economic factors), then it is necessary that political and cultural history be studied. But if the teacher is a Marxist and is inclined to put more emphasis on economic factors than do other teachers, he can claim to the academic freedom to do so. He is entitled to teach this interpretation, however, so long as the selection of events that go with it was not done at random to prove his theory, but was based on principles common to all historians.

4. Whether the teacher uses the cultural, political or economic approaches or merely adopts from each to form a cohesive approach of his own style, he should pay particular attention to yet another material aid in instruction—local history, the use of which is even now being emphasized in the United States. The use of local history is doubly important in the Philippines where serious efforts are being expended to discover unknown aspects of our history.

Now, what is the particular importance of local history in relation to the nature and purpose of teaching history? My fellow teachers in this group will perhaps agree with me that while history in all its aspects is exciting, most students find the history lessons that we handle dull and uninteresting. One of the reasons for this attitude is the student's remoteness from the lessons of history, the latter having no contact, whether emotional or material, with the student's life and experiences. Local history data may be employed to illustrate national or even international themes precisely to arouse the student's interest. It may take the form of a local survey or it may consist of a detail aspect of the community where the school is located. Not everybody, of course, would be interested in local history, but the teacher would have utilized a device linking the student to his immediate historical past. Moreover, tangible remains of local history often survive and it is this which underlines the reality, arouses imaginative sympathy and helps in understanding specific problems in history.

Thus, history students in Negros can well understand the impact of foreign trade on the Philippines, the coming of British and American capital to the province, the development of the sugar industry, if local history materials were made available to them, or if the history teacher took the extra effort in leading the class to a well-known historic spot, an old trading house perhaps, or if he asked his students to make a study of the oldest and most prominent families who have contributed to the development of their town and province. Or, for that matter, students in Laguna and Batangas would be more appreciative of the pre-colonial background of their respective provinces, if artifacts and materials of significance were appropriated and preserved by the provincial authorities rather than allow them to be transported to Manila to languish in an ill-kept museum or decorate many a home of a pseudo-cultured family. It goes without saying that trips to the museum or what passes for it and repositories of our cultural heritage and other historic spots, whenever time and finances would allow them, are an important aspect of instruction in history. Then, perhaps, our impressionable youth might really appreciate their country instead of turning their sights on some distant shores.

May I say, at this juncture, that the teacher who does not spare any opportunity in enlarging the student's understanding of local history, so sadly lacking among us, partakes of a particularly patriotic task, which even now the National Historical Commission is in the midst of such a herculean effort. For of even greater import to the Filipino teacher of history is the need to collate local historical materials in order to help in the collective job of integrating our historical facts.

5. In selecting and organizing content for courses in history, however, the teacher must consider other subjects in the social sciences being offered in his school. If the school offers a course in Philippine art which is part of the general curriculum (i.e., a prerequisite course for every student) or if it has a social studies course that includes discussion of the country's participation in regional cooperation in Asia (e.g., SEATO, ASEAN, MAPHILINDO) there is less need to spend much time studying the characteristics of pre-Spanish art and its evolution into colonial art or to go into great details inquiring into the role of the Philippines in the afore-mentioned regional associations. A careful examination of other social sciences courses should indicate to the history teacher areas

of overlapping and enable him not to spend much time on certain topics, thus providing space for greater depth of study for others. I am not, however, for the total elimination of such topics already discussed in other courses unless the teacher of history fully agrees with the interpretation and orientation of the teacher in those courses. It is in this potentially critical and controversial area of coordination between teachers in related disciplines that freedom of choice and interpretation must be assiduously observed.

On an even grander scale, another method to make history more interesting is the idea of team teaching. It is a method that has gained wide acceptance in many colleges and universities in the United States. It is premised on the assumption that no one could become an expert in the entire field of, say Philippine history or American history, but can at best be a specialist in a specific period or development. Consequently, certain history subjects could employ a team or a number of professors who agree on the course pattern and the topics or periods they each would tackle in teaching the subject. Thus, the student would really benefit from a teacher who would discuss the Japanese Occupation of the Philippines because he specialized in the study of this period, understand the problems of the immediate post-World War II period from another teacher who has done intensive research on these problems. Admittedly, this method could be used only in those schools that are willing to experiment and have enough faculty members who have engaged in post-graduate studies that have made them conversant and knowledgeable in certain specific fields of history.

6. Whatever method is used, the teaching of history usually brings with it the use of words and ideas that go beyond the comprehension of many students. This problem is particularly urgent in this country where most schools are plagued with a scarcity of materials that would help make the subject of history more popular and appreciated. Teachers constantly use the language of politics, economics, and the arts, and teachers and students at all instructional levels are daily bombarded by new and strange technical terms concocted by the specialized disciplines. Moreover, our students are taken into frequent ex-

cursions into societies and epochs unfamiliar to them. To be sure, the words that the history teacher skillfully uses can, more often than not, suffice to achieve understanding of the subject matter. But verbal images may not be enough, even to the college student, and many students may be ably aided in stimulating their imaginative powers and comprehending many difficult aspects of history with the help of visual aids.

The visual materials that the history teacher might use include pictures, photographs, documents (usually mere copies of the original), maps, charts, tapes, films and periodicals. Use of these aids could be augmented by visits to historical buildings, museums and historic sites. Visual materials, if they are to be an important adjunct to education, must be employed not only as a means of passive reception of information but as a method by which the students not only look at pictures but criticize, interpret and study that which the visual aid shows (or the visual material itself) in its proper historical context. The same principle should also apply to organized visits to historical sites. Both methods, when employed, should be occasions during which students might learn of the cultural achievements of a people or understand the ramifications of a particular problem in history.

It could be easy for the enterprising teacher to collect photographs and various visual aids which span different periods of development in Philippine history. He could build his own collection of photographs from periodicals and magazines. The teacher of world history could avail of reprints of paintings and sculptures and, if he is teaching in a school with a good library, he could use the slides, films and visual aids normally used by humanities and art appreciation subjects. Of course, the use of visual materials would be conditioned by the financial capacities of both teacher, his department and school. Films, tapes, charts and maps require no small appropriation measure but steps should be taken to provide each history teacher with the most essential visual aids.*

---

* The author, finding it absolutely necessary to use audio-visual materials in teaching Philippine cultural history (pre-Spanish to the present) had to spend her own money for the taping of indigeneous music of several cultural minorities and the photographing of rare prints, pictures and charts from such

These are only some of the recent trends in teaching history. I am rather uneasy with the use of the word "recent." Certainly, the aforementioned devices are not exactly new; variants go back many years. Consequently, the teacher of history may benefit from the experiences of his predecessors and elders in the profession.

Moreover, these approaches and devices will ask much of the teacher of history. They demand a great deal of him, beyond the education provided him in college. While he may feel satisfied with his method of teaching and his yellowed notes, he should accelerate his professional reading and initiate historical research himself. He will be refreshed by the exercise and his teaching enriched by the experience.

SOME SUGGESTED READINGS

Burston, W. H. *Principles of History Teaching*. London, 1963.

————————. *Studies in the Nature and Teaching of History*. London, 1967.

Burston, W. H. and C. W. Green. *Handbook for History Teachers*. Published by the University of London, Institute of Education. London, 1967.

Carpenter, Peter. *History Teaching, the Era Approach*. Cambridge, 1964.

Engle, Shirley, ed. *New Perspective in World History*. Published by the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D. C., 1964.

Smith, S. A. *Towards World Understanding: Bias in History Textbooks and Teaching*. London, 1962.

Vann Woodward, C. *The Age of Re-Interpretation*. Publication No. 35. Service Center for Teachers of History, American Historical Association, October 1, 1960.

---

inaccessible and rare books as the *Ilustracion Filipina* and *Harper's History of the [Filipino-American] War*.

The Teaching of History And other Social Sciences*

Gregorio C. Borlaza

THE FOLLOWING Filipino saying may serve as a good starting point for our discussion of the teaching of history:

> "Ang hindi lumilingon sa pinanggalingan
> Ay di makararating sa patutunguhan."
>
> (One who does look back to where he came from
> Will never reach his destination.)

A nation which forgets or ignores its cultural moorings loses its national identity, its self-respect and the respect of other peoples. It loses its sense of direction and becomes unstable under economic and political pressures in its domestic affairs and international relations. It is for these reasons that the study of history is of great importance.

It is not being suggested here that the study of history should be confined to the history of one's country. The history of any country is necessarily interlinked with that of many other countries and of the entire world. The study of history should, therefore, develop in the student an intelligent internationalism based on sound nationalism.

---

* Paper read in the Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at the Immaculate Conception College, Davao City, on March 23, 1972.

The Filipinos are often accused of possessing, and being strongly influenced by, what is called colonial mentality. In the effort to overcome this there seems to be a tendency toward chauvinism, the opposite extreme. The Philippines will do well to chart its course within the bounds of the golden mean between these two extremes.

History is an interesting subject. Unfortunately, it does not appear so to many students because of the wrong way it has been customarily taught as a body of facts to be mastered—of dates, places, names, wars and their causes and results, names and provisions of treaties, and other things to be memorized, recited in the classroom, and written on examination papers.

The teaching of history should aim at much more than mere mastery of facts, important though historical facts may be. It should aim at the development of critical thinking, the inculcation of values, the formation of sound attitudes and appreciations, and the acquisition of certain habits and skills

We can see around us many evidences of failure to accomplish these objectives of history teaching. We see young people laughing at the old veterans of the Philippine Revolution during parades because they can no longer march in straight rows and keep in step with one another. We see the monuments to our heroes either neglected or desecrated; the national flag improperly displayed; the national anthem not accorded the reverence due it, and our Constitution openly flaunted. The behavior of many of our government officials, lawmakers and Con-Con delegates show an utter lack of a sense of history.

If the foregoing social ills must be remedied the teaching of history through the use of the textbooks must be supplemented with practical exercises and activities. History must not be merely read; it must be experienced. The Japanese children are given the feel of their great historical past from early childhood. From the early grades they are taken on field trips to local historical spots and shrines. They are also taken out on field trips to observe the beauty of nature. In both kinds of field trips they are led to develop a deep appreciation of beauty—the beauty of nature and the beauty of the soul of their local and national heroes.

In the Philippines there are many historic places in every town and province. Very often the pupils go through elementary and high school without visiting them, sometimes without even noticing their presence or learning their significance. Our pupils are tied too closely to the classroom; they are made slaves of the textbooks, meaning the few textbooks that are available.

There are many other ways of experiencing history, such as viewing movies and slides; making replicas or drawings of historical objects and artifacts; or making sand-table illustrations of historic events like the famous Battle of Tirad Pass.

The history teacher must not be a mere master of historical facts. He must be closely familiar with other areas of social studies, and he must have more than a nodding acquaintance with other fields of knowledge, because history cannot be taught in isolation. One cannot teach historical events apart from their geographical setting and the social, economic and anthropological backgrounds of the people involved. One cannot explain historical events without resorting to a logical explanation of causes and effects. Biography, the novel, and poetry as well as the graphic and the performing arts are rich sources of historical information and effective media of teaching the subject. The need to use varied tools requires some measure of versatility and breadth of cultural background on the part of the teacher.

The history teacher must possess skill in managing various forms of classroom technique, if the teaching of history is to be raised from the traditional question-and-answer method. He must possess the necessary skill in conducting such activities as debates, dramatization, dialogue, symposium, and others. He must know how to guide the pupils in reporting on their readings and personal observations.

In the foregoing types of activities the students cannot participate effectively unless they have a command of the language of instruction. For this reason it may often be necessary for the students to use Pilipino or other native languages. The teacher must therefore be sufficiently at home in the native language in the place where he teaches, and in Pilipino, and he should encourage the students to use their native language and Pilipino if they are not sufficiently at home in English.

The discussion of current events is an essential part of the teaching of history. Current events are history in the making. They have links, both direct and indirect, to past history. As in the teaching of history proper, the traditional factual method of teaching current events must give way to the interpretive and conceptual. Take the recent visit to the Philippines of Indonesian President Soeharto. Instead of merely stating the time and the date of arrival and departure, the places visited, and the functions attended, the following should be taken up:

1. The nearness of Indonesia to the Philippines; the political, economic, and military implication of this closeness.
2. Why President and Mrs. Soeharto look very much like Filipinos;
3. Similarity between Indonesian and Philippine languages, the reason for this similarity, and its significance;
4. Interpretation of the joint communique of President Marcos and President Soeharto, and evaluation of the proposed Joint Philippine-Indonesian patrol, in the light of the foregoing similarities.
5. Capsule history of Indonesia after the war:
    a. Indonesia under Soekarno
    b. The failure of the attempted communist coup
    c. The overthrow of Soekarno and the emergence of Soeharto as the new leader
    d. Implications for the Philippines
6. Activities which may be undertaken:
    a. Presenting an Indonesian dance or song
    b. Making a scrapbook on Indonesia—its monuments (the Burubudur), its people, products, scenic spots (Bali), etc.
    c. Inviting an Indonesian resource person (one is available such as in Manila and in the provinces of southern Mindanao and in Sulu) or a Filipino who has been to Indonesia to talk about some as-

pects of Indonesian history or social life.

d. Study of how Indonesians have vitally affected Philippine history
    (1) The early Indonesian immigrants
    (2) The illegal immigrants into Mindanao
    (3) Individuals like Tan Malaka who introduced communism into the Philippines

Let us take up briefly at random a few other examples of how current events may be treated:

1. The visit to the Philippines of Pope Paul VI may be an occasion for the discussion of the history of the Papacy; the tremendous power once enjoyed by the Pope, one of whom partitioned the world between two European countries; the rise of Protestantism; the division of Catholicism into Eastern and Western rites and the effort at reunification started by Pope John XXIII; and a capsule history of Catholic faith in the Philippines.

2. The dragging election controversy between Elizalde and Almendras may lead to the study of the history of popular suffrage; the importance of free and clean elections; and the duties of citizens in a democracy to protect the right of suffrage.

3. The student rallies may serve as a starting point for the study of their motives and methods; the analysis of the social, economic, and political ills that have generated and sustained them; and the history of similar movements abroad.

4. Here is an example that actually happened in Zamora Elementary School in Pandacan, Manila: Since Father Jacinto Zamora, one of the three martyr priests of 1872, was born in Pandacan, the Zamora Elementary School, under the leadership of its principal, Mrs. Angelina G. Eliquin, decided to take an active part in the observance of the first centenary of the martyrdom of Fathers Gomez, Burgos and Zamora on February 17, 1972. Months before the events they started a long-range plan. The teachers conducted researches on the life and times of Father Zamora in Pandacan. They interviewed descendants of close relatives, and consulted old documents and memorabilia. The materials gathered were bound. It is planned to donate them to the Gomburza Centennial Commission. They also gathered memorabilia, made scrapbooks, and had a Gom-

burza exhibition. One of the teachers wrote the script of a pageant entitled "Gomburza," conducted rehearsals and directed the presentation. Others managed a school-wide declamation contest from kindergarten to Grade V, and an oratorical contest in Grade VI, all on the subject of the Gomburza martyrdom.

The Pandacan Civic Circle, Pandacan Women's Club and Kababaihang Balagtas, as sponsors, provided the prizes. Since the execution chair, the *garrote,* was often mentioned in the pieces entered in the contests, the pupils began asking what the *garrote* looked like. To satisfy their curiosity, a replica of the instrument of death was made in the school shop and placed on exhibit, complete with a dummy, dressed as a priest, being "executed." In the morning of February 17, the day of the observance, a Mass was held in the school campus, in loving memory of the three martyrs. In the afternoon the culminating activity was held in the form of a program where the pageant was presented, and the winners in the declamation and oratorical contests delivered their pieces and received their prizes. Prof. Esteban A. de Ocampo, the Chairman of the National Historical Commission, was the guest speaker. It will be noted that in this activity, all the teachers, not only those teaching history, all pupils from kindergarten to Grade VI, and the community were involved.

One stumbling block in the study of current events is the lack of newspapers and magazines in most Philippine schools and colleges. The few newspapers and magazines available are read by only a few and are thrown away or sold as scrap. Their usefulness can be multiplied, if the magazines are bound, indexed and catalogued, and if the imported newspaper articles are clipped and filed alphabetically in vertical files for ready reference.

It may also be said that the dearth of reference books adversely affects the study of history in general just as the dearth of newspapers and magazines adversely affects the study of current events. This is especially true in the elementary and high schools. Even in colleges, teachers and students rely heavily on a single textbook and one or two reference books. A history book, no matter how objective the author has tried to be, reflects the unconscious biases of of the author, and no single textbook can be adequate where some controversial issues have to be studied, and there are many controversial issues in history. In Philippine history, for instance, the following examples may be cited:

1. Is Aguinaldo to blame for the death of Andres Bonifacio and Antonio Luna?
2. Did George Dewey promise Aguinaldo the recognition by the United States of Philippine independence or not?
3. Assuming that he did, was Aguinaldo right in taking the word of Dewey?
4. Would it have been better for us if the Philippines had never been a colony of Spain or the United States?

In connection with the study of history, especially of controversial issues, the students must be trained to get ideas accurately and to examine the different sides to a question. They must therefore be helped in acquiring certain study skills such as the following:

1. Knowing the resources available in a library;
2. Evaluating the accuracy, objectivity and reliability of a book in terms of the competence and prestige of the author, the sources used, the recency of publication, and the nature of treatment;
3. Noting errors and inconsistencies in the book;
4. Analyzing the logic of certain conclusions made by the author on certain questions;
5. Comparing the findings of different authors on a certain controversial issue;
6. Taking notes and using them in preparing a summary or report; and
7. Interpreting maps, charts and graphs and using these illustrative materials to explain or clarify certain points.

The ability to notice errors and inconsistencies is very important because historical information has a strong influence on human attitudes. We once noticed, for instance, that American history books, in general, erroneously state that under the Treaty of Paris the Philippines was bought by the United States from Spain for $20,000,000 instead of stating the fact that the money paid was merely to compensate Spain for the permanent improvements made in this country, such as government buildings, piers, etc. This error is found even in posters displayed on the lobby of the ground floor of the State Department building in Washington, D.C. When we visited some elementary and high school classes in Wisconsin, and we were introduced as a man from the Philippines, some pupils stood up and said, in a condescending manner, "Is that the country we bought from Spain? When did we buy you?" Who knows if the kind of treatment we are getting from some U. S. army men and big American capitalists may be due to this unfortunate error in American history books?

In these days of knowledge explosion, it is necessary for students not only to understand what they read but also to be able to read very fast without sacrificing comprehension. There must be a close tie-up between the reading and the history teachers. Where the same person teaches both subjects to the same set of pupils, the teacher can closely correlate the two subjects by using as reading practice materials not only those found in basic and supplementary readers but also those found in textbooks in history, geography, economics and and other social studies subjects.

There are many ways of organizing history courses. It may be the history of a particular area such as the history of a town, city, province, country, region, or the world. It may be the history of an ideology such as the history of socialism or western thought. There are also the history of philosophy and religion, of land transportation, water transportation, and air transportation; of a particular organization or institution; and many others. The first is the most common. Thus we have the history of Manila, of the Philippines, of Asia, of the Far East, of Europe, of the United States, and of the world. Pupils in the lower grades may start with the history of their barrio and town. From there they can expand to that of their province, the Philippines, and so on. In the first three cases—in the history of the barrio, town and province, there is generally a dearth of printed materials. The pupils and teachers may have to help build up local historical literature. We have seen this admirably done in one of the schools in Cavite City where they had prepared mimeographed short biographies of the ranking officers of the Philippine Revolution, many of whom had never been mentioned in any history book.

It is an unfortunate fact of life that because of our historical association with two Western countries, especially with the United States which organized and shaped the course of our present educational system, we know more of the history of the Western world than of Asia and the Far East where we belong. As a result, we have come to be looked upon as strangers in our own neighborhood. Without abandoning the study of Western civilization we must exert new efforts at getting more familiar with our fellow Asians—their history, their religion, their customs and traditions, and common aspirations.

Heretofore, the paper-and-pencil test has been used almost exclusively in measuring the result of instruction in history. The emphasis has been on the mastery of facts. Pupils with photographic memory get high grades irrespective of the desirable social and political attitudes they may have failed to form and the skills they may have failed to develop. This form of evaluation needs to be supplemented with others. Students attitudes and behavior, their ability to do critical and creative thinking, their social attitudes, their skills in the use of the tools of learning, and other outcomes of the learning process must somehow be measured or at least observed and roughly recorded, not so much for determining the grades to appear on the students' report card but for the purpose of helping them become efficient persons and useful citizens of the Philippines and of the world. The students' notes, scrapbooks and their participation in such activities as presenting historical plays and pageants, and preparing sandtable illustrations or dioramas provide a good means of observing the benefits they are deriving from the study of history, or of any other subject for that matter.

So much for the teaching of history. Let us now consider briefly the teaching of the other Social Studies.

Social Studies, according to Good's *Dictionary of Education,* refers to "those portions of the subject matter of the social sciences, partly history, economics, political science, sociology and geography which are regarded as suitable for study in the elementary and secondary schools and are developed into courses of study . . . and of which both the subject matter and the aims are predominantly social, not to be confused with social sciences or with subjects which have social aim but not social content." In the Philippines, Character Education is included in its scope. The main objective of the social studies is to develop morally sound, socially, vocationally, and economically efficient, and civic spirited citizens in a democracy.

There are evidences which seem to indicate that education is not adequately accomplishing this objective. The Philippines is one of the richest countries in natural resources, but we are one of the poorest peoples in the world because our people have not suffiicently developed vocational and economic efficiency. It cannot be said that the morality of the individual Filipino is in direct proportion to his educational attainment. Newly harvested rice may be left unguarded in the open fields at night in the rural areas inhabited by the less educated and the uneducated peasants without any danger of getting lost. Once placed under the custody of some supposedly educated owners of bonded warehouses or of some educated high salaried officials of RCA the same rice gets lost by the hundreds of thousands of sacks. The ignorant may steal a few pesos out of necessity, but the educated steal millions out of greed. There is less cheating, intimidation and vote buying in the less closely supervised barrio elections where the candidates are comparatively less educated than in the provincial and national elections where the candidates are mostly college and university graduates.

The situation calls for some soul searching on our part as teachers. Could it be that our teaching is too verbalistic and our method of evaluation too much oriented to the mere mastery of facts? In a study undertaken in Laguna in 1947, which covered all central schools and a majority of the barrio high schools in the province for a period of one semester, it was found that 90% of the questions in the daily recitations and 97% of those in the quizzes and periodic tests were factual in nature. The record of the recitations taken down by the head teachers, principals and supervisors who participated in in the study did not show an adequate effort to develop basic habits, skills, attitudes and appreciations, and the ability to think. Memorization of facts seemed to constitute the main objective of all teaching and evaluative activities in the subject. It will be interesting to repeat this study at present, not only in Laguna but also in other parts of the country.

Perhaps another weakness in the handling of the social studies is that many teachers often forget the importance of their personal examples in the character development of their pupils. They often forget that, in the words of former Bureau of Public Schools Director Vitaliano Bernardino, teachers must be the epitome of good moral character in the eyes of the pupils. It should be a cause of deep sorrow whenever the periodicals, like the *Philippines Free Press* and many of the daily papers, carry reports of teachers and school officials committing acts which besmirch the good name of the teaching profession. For it is a sad fact of life that a few school officials linked with suspicious purchases of school supplies and a few teachers accused of immorality, dishonesty, and other irregularities adversely affect the good name of the whole teaching profession in which we can find many of the finest men and women in our country today. A tiny spot of ink on an immaculately white sheet of paper attracts more attention than the white paper itself.

A third weakness of our social studies program may be found in the misapprehension of many teachers about the place of God in the classroom. The development of faith in God is the number-one item both in the Quezon Code of Ethics and in the Objectives of Education as drafted by the Board of National Education. It is at the head of the list of character traits to be developed in Character Education provided in Bulletin No. 10, s. 1959. And yet, in the actual day-to-day implementation of these objectives many a teacher has been afraid to mention God, confusing the development of faith in God with the forbidden practice of promoting sectarian religion.

Lately, we have been reading of the resurgence of the Huk movement in Central Luzon and the Cagayan Valley. What is it that makes this movement so virile as to survive the capture and/or surrender of its top leaders, including the entire membership of the Politburo? It is so convenient to tag the Huks as misguided elements, but we must go deeper into the question for there are certain socio-economic and political causes of unrest which must be removed before we may hope to restore peace and stability in the country. Social unrest will persist as long as the masses are left in extreme poverty, without hope of securitg reforms through constitutional processes. We teach our pupils better ways of life, and we should continue doing so. But at the same time we must help develop their ability to increase their earning; otherwise, we shall be widening the gap between the level of material wants and the level of their ability to satisfy those wants, thereby aggravating the social ferment. It is a wrong practice to make government offices, especially those in government-owned or -controlled corporations, dumping places for the huge army of unemployed. We should educate them for creative pursuits and provide them with economically productive job opportunities. We must develop their creative imagination so that, if necessary, they may be able to create job opportunities for themselves and for others as well.

We are teaching our pupils their rights, and we should never tire of doing so. But the agencies concerned and the wealthy minority in our population should not deny them those rights; otherwise, we shall never see the end of the dissident movement. We are teaching our pupils the sacredness of the ballot in a democratic society, and we must never flag in the effort to do so, but as long as moneyed politicians continue corrupting our impoverished voters with a ganta of rice, a can of sardines and a few crisp peso bills, our teaching will sound hollow and empty to those whom we are trying to educate. We are teaching them to read intelligently, and rightly so, but if afterwards they will have nothing to read but comic magazines of doubtful moral value and newspapers full of denunciation of inefficiency, dishonesty, discourtesy and immorality in our democratic government, appearing side by side with the beautiful picture of Communist China painted by members of a senatorial party and a party of newspapermen which recently visited that country, we can never fully succeed in developing love for the democratic way of life.

From the foregoing discussion we may deduce certain basic principles which may be useful in mapping out the future development of the curriculum in the Social Studies. Here are a few of them:

1. The teaching of Social Studies should include a greater amount of experiences which will promote the development of desired attitudes and appreciations, habits and skills. The paper-and-pencil tests which are mostly factual in nature, should be supplemented by inventories of attitudes and appreciations, habits and skills, based on the teachers' observation of the pupils' behavior and reactions.

2. All school teachers and officials can succeed in developing the moral character of the pupils only insofar as they can show by the example of their daily lives the character traits they are seeking to develop in their pupils.

3. The prohibition against promoting any sectarian religion in the classroom does not forbid the teaching of love of God, faith in Him and obedience in His commandments.

4. Side by side with increasing the level of the needs of the people, education should also increase the level of their capacity to satisfy those needs, and industry must provide ever-increasing job opportunities commensurate with the growth in the number of people equipped with job capabilities. The creative imagination of the pupils should be stimulated and developed in the hope that, some day, some of them may be able to create job opportunities for themselves and for others.

5. Side by side with teaching the people their rights, the government and the society, particularly the wealthy and powerful minority in that society, should provide a climate in which

there is no obstruction to the enjoyment of those rights.

6. Social Studies should be situation derived. While sets of objectives and courses of study are essential, there are significant day-to-day developments which affect the objectives and content of education, which cannot be predicted. The teachers must be capable of making intelligent use of current events.

7. Social Studies classes should be equipped with enough dictionaries, encyclopedias (if possible), atlases, maps, charts, and other illustrative materials.

8. Side by side with the development of the pupils' ability to read, there should be a simultaneous effort to provide decent and worthwhile reading materials, and to clear the newspapers, as much and as fast as possible, of news which weaken and destroy faith in the democratic way of life. Needless to say, the latter should be sought not by censoring news media but but by removing the ugly spots from the very way we live democracy itself. News media are the mirrors of life; the images appearing thereon can only be as clear and pleasing as the life which they reflect.

9. The objectives of the Social Studies cannot be fully accomplished within the confines of social studies alone. All other subject areas must be involved. Social Studies should therefore be closely correlated with all other subject fields.

There are other principles which may be cited, but let the foregoing suffice as examples which, we hope, will be helpful in the formulation of others. We can talk here on and on the whole day without being able to do full justice to our topic within the limited time at our disposal. Before I close may I be permitted to leave with you one parting thought. Our country, according to President Marcos, is in crisis. We are surrounded by countries where a godless ideology has won control over one-third of the world's population and where it is seeking to gain control over hundreds of millions more. At home, we are beset by the advance forces of this ideology. Whether our people will support this dissident movement or remain faithful to the democratic way of life will depend largely upon the extent to which they can enjoy a decent life in freedom and dignity under our democratic system; otherwise, in the words uttered by no less than President Marcos himself at the unveiling of the GOMBURZA monument, the people will have the right to revolt. Their faith in our form of government can never be stronger than the extent to which the people in the government, including the school teachers and officials, deserve that faith. Just as the surface of the sea becomes clear blue or murky, depending upon whether the sky above it is clear or cloudy, so the morality of those in the higher echelons of society. The curriculum in Social Studies must therefore be something more than a set of written objectives, courses of study, and minimum accomplishments. It must be a way of life, enriched and ennobled by the exemplary lives of upright school teachers and school officials who plan and implement it.

The Inter-Disciplinary Approach in the Teaching of History*

R. Joel de los Santos, Jr.

NOT SO LONG AGO, in an informal gathering of teachers, I was jolted by a loud proposition to phase out history as a course in the college curriculum because it is just an irritating chronicle of names and dates. I wanted to readily dismiss the suggestion as absurd. However, I noticed that the matron-looking woman was not joking. I found out later that she was a candidate for a doctoral degree in education.

At another time, when the scope of sociology was intellectually discussed, the speaker (doctoral degree holder from an Indian university) came out with a similar observation.

If those with the highest academic degree in our society would unhesitatingly consign history to the graveyard of useless pursuits, then something must be wrong—either with the science of history or on the observations of detractors. This misconception can be traced to the last century, and even before, when the general view was chronology-cum-geography, with nothing in-between. The outlook would of course reduce history to just a litany of names, dates and places.

Today, even historians themselves rarely agree on just one definition of "history" in precisely the same way the rival schools are debating on what kind of material their "history" would include. There are some who advice that it should primarily contain facts about the early economic institutions of men. This particular perspective of the past thus becomes a series of confrontations between antagonistic camps, likewise with competing economic and class interest-groups. In line with their reasoning, the Malolos Constitution would therefore be a class document; the rivalry between Bonifacio and Aguinaldo was a struggle between the privilege and commonality. The binding theme of history then becomes class conflict.[1]

---

* Paper read in the Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at the Baguio Colleges, Baguio City, on May 26, 1972.

Others negate the existence of such conflict and claim that the past struggles were generated by some imagined, rather than real, injustice. Men believed that they were exploited and victimized when they were really emotionally disturbed. Unger notes that this shift, in the analysis of conflict, reduces the emotional charge of past historical movements because what is suggested is that all the discontented are more malingerers.[2]

Still, there are others who insist that true history is of the beliefs and institutionalized habits of man, the beliefs which the masses have actually entertained, and which have determined the course of men's relations.[3]

For our purpose, I shall define history as all endeavors to reconstruct past events along casual lines with the help of remnants or traces that they left in nature or human memory. History then is more than just chronological or geographical reconstruction. If it were so, then the collection of descriptive data would only become what Ibn Khaldoun call "surface history."[4]

The research on chronological and geographical data alone is by itself already a gigantic task that involves mental and moral disciplines as well as strong intellectual powers. And the work does not end, but rather begins, here. After definition and verification of facts, comes the more subtle process of "discovering their casual relations—the great play of influence among human events, the interdependence of events, the action and reaction and counteraction of events."[5] Disconnected facts have no interest in themselves. Facts begin to acquire significance only when they are grouped in a system of cause and effect.[6]

---

[1] Irwin Unger, "The New Left and American History", *The American Historical Review*, July 1967, pp. 1237-1263.

[2] Irwin Unger, *op.* and *loc. cit.*, p. 1240.

[3] John Herman Randall, Jr., "History and the Social Sciences", *Gateway to the Social Sciences*, Ed. Arthur Thompson, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

[4] Cesar A. Majul, "Ibn Khaldoun and Arad Thought". *University College Journal*, No. 10, 2nd Semester 1966, p. 108.

The organization of facts, according to the principles of casuality, makes history a science and the historian a social scientist. Relatively, the eminent psychologist Skinner observes that "science is more than mere description of events as they occur. It is an attempt to discover order; to show that certain events stand in lawful relations to other events."[7]

Consequently, the reconstruction would necessitate the study of man—his political, economic and psychological features, and other things about him. Generally, it would involve the study of the individual, society and culture. Among social scientists, the emergence of specialization in social sciences has come out with the division of labor which could immensely facilitate the task of the historian. As Ralph Linton puts its, "The individual has been assigned to psychology, society to sociology, and culture to cultural anthropology . . . It is now becoming apparent that the integration between the individual, society and culture is so close and their interaction so continuous that the investigator who tries to work with any of them without reference to the other two soon comes to a dead end."[8]

The interdependence and interpenetration of the social sciences increasingly become apparent, especially in the study of contemporary social phenomena. Because of its utilization function, all possible analytical tools should be used in the endeavor, so as to gain insight into the consequences of man's activities. The conclusions derived therefrom can be applied to present and future problems. After all, it is in the ability to help man cope with his problems that social science would have its strongest reason to exist.

---

[5] Moses C. Tyler, *Library of Universal History* (New York: R. S. Peale and J. A. Hill, 1898), Vol. I, p. v.

[6] Gaetano Salvamini, "Historians and Scientists" in *Gateway to the Social Sciences,* 1961.

[7] B. F. Skinner, *Science and Human Behavior* (New York: The Free Press 1953), p. 6.

[8] Linton Ralph as quoted by Thompson in *Gateway to the Social Sciences*, p. 284.

The concern of social science is also the same in history for any past experience of man is a matter of history. This includes even contemporary events, even like yesterday's deliberations of the Constitutional Convention in the Manila Hotel and the incidents published in this morning newspapers, which were already affairs of the past. I mentioned this because the widely accepted division between history and social science is chronology. According to this concept, history pertains to events of which there are no longer living witnesses, whereas social science deals with contemporary events about which ocular observations can be made. Behind, however, is the attitude that sneers at the past—that of calling history, the dead past! Incidentally, this disparaging behavior elicited from a historian the comment that: "The past is not dead, except to persons who are ignorant of it, or who are themselves dead in their own thinking concerning it."[9]

Therefore, in the study of man's past, whether the same be remote or proximate, the interdisciplinary approach would be most logical inasmuch as social science disciplines have come up with better methods of investigation and formulation of laws governing his actions. The overall picture of his development would thus be the scope of history. As a result, history looms to be the central or unifying social science.

After showing the dependence of history on the social sciences, let us find out how these disciplines also lean on history. Allow me to share with you the views of Dr. John Herman Randall, Jr. He claims that the social sciences are fundamentally historical in character in at least three basic ways: (a) their subject matter is fundamentally historical; (b) many of the institutions they deal with have an essentially temporal and historical structure: they are human ways of acting that become unified only in the light of historically generated problems; (c) they necessarily employ methods of historical analysis—though by no means exclusively.[10]

---

[9] Moses C. Tyler, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. viii.

What then is the relation between history and the social sciences? On this score, Randall concludes, "History cannot do its job without the social sciences and the social sciences cannot do theirs without history. Each needs the other, but neither is to be confused with the other, or absorbed in, or reduced to the other."[11]

The inter-disciplinary approach in the study and teaching of history means the use of social science formulations in understanding and explaining historical phenomena. History refers mainly with man and a lot of information about him has already been accumulated in the social science disciplines. These information could be invaluable to the historian in his attempt to portray a complete picture of the past, which is the object of his study.

In the analysis of characteristics during any given period, for example, the history student will have to rely upon the anthropologist's definition of culture which term means more than mere refinement or corruption in taste. In fact, all our history textbooks have been influenced by anthropological definition of culture, as all learned behavior, or more precisely, as "patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior, acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiment in artifacts . . ."[12]

As if knowledge of culture is not overwhelming enough, the student has to penetrate deeper to discern the interaction between the development of culture and the individual personality operating within its confines. In so doing, he should be particularly attuned not only to what is regularly patterned within that culture, but also to the idiosyncratic elements that have impinged upon it.

---

[10] John Herman Randall, Jr., *op. cit.*, p. 379.

[11] John Herman Randall, Jr., *ibid.*, p. 383.

[12] Clyde Kluckholn, *Culture and Behavior*. Quoted by David Brion Davis in "Some Recent Directions in American Cultural History", *American Historical Review*, Feb. 1968, p. 696.

Historical inquiry on the lives of individuals is also important because the progress of the human race can be fully known with the knowledge of the roles of such outstanding personalities as Jesus Christ, Lenin, and Queen Victoria.

THE USE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE TECHNIQUES

Faced with an excess of problems, what appears as the biggest challenge to the historian would be the voluminous historical data. This becomes more apparent when he tackles contemporary history. Necessarily, everything has an historical aspect which can thus become an appropriate subject matter of historical inquiry.

The historian who writes contemporary events for the students of tomorrow will have to resort to facts and figures that are often the basis of important political, economic and social decisions and policies of today. His task will be easy if he has a working knowledge of statistical methods and theory—devices frequently used by the social science disciplines, especially in economics. Statistics "refers to that branch of science which deals with the collection, presentation, analysis and interpretation of quantitative data."[14] Statistical methods refer to those procedures and techniques used in the collection, presentation, analysis and interpretation of quantitative data."[15] "Statistical theory deals with the development and exposition of theories which constitutes the basis of the statistical method."[16]

In an interesting article on quantification in history, the author stated that the condensation of data by means of quantitative methods, when it is clearly legitimate, constitutes a saving of time convenience in that it makes information easier to describe and handle. The author also claimed that quantification helps to insure a greater degree of accuracy.[17] The argument also stood for a quantitative presentation of available information which can help direct student's attention to the

---

[13] David Davis, "Recent Directions in American Cultural History", *American Historical Review,* Feb. 1968, p. 704.

[14] Cristina P. Parel, et. al. *Introduction to Statistical Methods,* p. 1.

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] William O. Aydelotte, "Quantification in History", *The American Historical Review,* April 1966, p. 805.

questions most worthy of investigation. The writer explained that "Since it brings the whole of the evidence, on the point it covers, into intelligible focus, the general character of the findings can be more readily perceived and relationships and differences emerge that could not so easily have been observed without this reduction of the data."[18] He further observed that a quantitative analysis offers a systematic means of testing hypothesis. Finally, he presented the argument that measurement locates the defect in the original hypothesis and registers the departure from theory with an authority and finesse that no qualitative technique can duplicate.[19]

Presently, when scholars in the academe are increasingly called upon to perform the functions of social critics, the adoption of the quantitative method is advantageous. The efforts of Dr. Dante Simbulan, in his study of the elites of this country, are an example of how quantification can validate a historical generalization.

This procedure could also help in an analytical understanding of such contemporary exigencies as agrarian unrest in Central Luzon, student activism, and the Muslim-Christian confrontation in Mindanao. For a better comprehension and recognition of the dimensions of these problems, it would be worthwhile to consult such quantifiable data as population growth, land and space ownerships, migration patterns, income levels, crime rates, unemployment charts, investment schemes, infrastructure programs, etc.

Applicable in the perusal of such political phenomena as leadership and personalities are the techniques of psychoanalysis and other branches of psychiatry. Factor analysis and attitude measurement have already been employed to determine the attitudes of political groups. Public opinion can now be gauged through the questionnaire system and interview techniques. These are only a few of the social science devices that, if legitimately used, could contribute to the better understanding and teaching of historical events.

However, these devices, as tools for historical research and teaching, have their own limitations. The deeper we dig into the past, the lesser historical materials are available. Moreover, the desire for accuracy is hampered by unrealiable, inadequate and even conflicting sources such as varying figures and conflicting official reports. While these circumstances are substantial, they are not justifiable reasons for the omission of said devices.

---

[18] *Ibid.*
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 806.

The inter-disciplinary approach also contribute to the suppression of intellectual partisanship which is a blunder relevant in many history textbooks today. The teacher of history should not act as a lawyer of an issue; he should assume the role of a judge who stands for what is true after hearing both sides.

Intellectual partnership could be considered myopia and history teachers classified under this pitiful category are usually in the polarized extremes of political thought. In the Philippines, one extreme may be discerned by their crude efforts to sanitize the pernicious rule of clerical and colonial institutions in the shaping of the national patrimony. The other is recognized by their persecution complex that is particularly anticipatory. This breed starts their study of history with prior convictions, accepting or rejecting historical facts without regard, however, to that prior opinion. Despite emotional and political differences, both share a common feature—the propensity to become propagandists for their respective side of any issue.

I hope that I have expounded the advantages of inter-disciplinary approach in the teaching and study of history. I do not possess any proficiency with the social science devices. I do not have the training, much less the experience, to claim such. All I want is to manifest that the individual, society and culture have already been deeply explored by the social sciences. And, since history has a similar concern, then it reasonably follows that the teaching and understanding of history can be hopefully enhanced with the help of the social sciences. I am now prepared for questions.

Re-Examining Approaches, Methods and Techniques Of Teaching in Social Sciences *

Diosdado G. Capino

THE MAIN PURPOSE of my paper is to present important ideas on the methodology of teaching history. I shall discuss (1) some characteristics of the teacher, instructor or professor teaching history, (2) the teacher's attitude towards the learner, and (3) practical suggestions in teaching history.

Some Important Characteristics of the History Teacher

Cardinal in learning and teaching history is the teacher, instructor, or professor for the "essence of the teaching art lies in the character of the person."[1]

1. Foremost among the qualities of a good teacher is the *continuing growth in knowledge* of the subject she teaches. This is a demand for excellence in teaching requires breadth of knowledge. It is the responsibility of the teacher to read more and more on the "new knowledge" being unearthed or

---

* Lecture delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the Philippine Historical Association at the Teachers' Camp, Baguio City, on March 31, 1973.

[1] Earl V. Pullilas and Aileene Lockhart, *Toward Excellence in College Teaching* (Wm. C. Brown Co., Publishers, Iowa, 1963), p. 98.

brought about by persons doing research work or studies. The teacher of history, for instance, must read or get acquainted with the monumental work sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on the global history of mankind. In his preface to the six-volume *History of Mankind,* subtitled *Cultural and Scientific Development,* the president of the International Commission on History wrote:

> Beyond differences of race, climate, economic structures and systems of ideas, history shows the fundamental identity of the various groups, making it possible to discern, in many cases, profound analogies among the transformations they have undergone from the Palaeolithic era to the present time. If we consider the human species as a whole, we perceive that the course of its evolution has been accomplished from one region and from one people to another by way of a series of oscillations, greater or lesser in extent, longer or shorter in duration. The different civilizations which have arisen in the course of the ages correspond to distinct phases and patterns of this general movement. Almost every one of them is to be found somewhere in the world of today. Contemporary society appears as a mosaic in which the most widely differing cultures adjoin and confront each other.[2]

The reading of the six volumes will give the teacher a "fresh outlook on the achievements of man" and will enrich her various "approaches" in teaching history and other social sciences.

2. A second dynamic characteristic of a good teacher of history is her *continuing interest* in the knowledge of other fields of inquiry related to the subject she teaches, such as economic, social, cultural, and political history. Without disturbing the natural unity of the past, it is important for the history teacher to view those segments of the past through which people's lives have been particularly lined. This will enrich the teacher's historical background.[3]

3. A third inspiring characteristic of a history teacher is her *continuing concern* in the knowledge of other subjects, such as sociology, anthropology, archaeology, economics, and political science which can enrich historical knowledge. The

---

[2] G. Metraux, "History of Mankind: A Global View of Scientific and Cultural Development," *The Unesco Courier* (June, 1963), p. 5.

[3] Robert V. Daniels, *Studying History: How and Why* (Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1966, p. 13; *Approaches to History;* edited by H. P. Finberg, (University of Toronto, Toronto, 1962), pp. vii-viii.

historian in writing history considers the *reconstruction of the past* for his own sake. The teacher of history views the *importance of content* in terms of its usefulness and values to a group of students.[4]

4. A fourth laudable characteristic of a history teacher is *her enthusiasm or zest* in her work. When a history teacher has an ardent belief in the task she is doing and gives energy to put life to it, the learning process becomes fruitful. This becomes significant because many students consider the study of history a "dry activity."[5]

5. A fifth worth-while characteristic of a dynamic teacher of history is *imagination.* A teacher with a great power of imagination can effectively put things to be learned—whether a fact or principle—into a meaningful perspective. The teacher and the students continuously discern new and meaningful relationships. The process of learning and teaching becomes enlightened and enlivened.[6]

6. A sixth desirable characteristic of an excellent teacher of history is *resourcefulness.* Resourcefulness is imperative in enriching the content and organization of the materials of instruction. It is indispensable in the learning process in giving life to what is taught through the extensive use of visual aids. The success of using the historical approach in handling controversial issues depends very much on the resourcefulness of the teacher. The teacher, in fact, must always be on the alert for opportunities in using the appropriate parallels and backgrounds which history holds for the study of current issues.[7]

7. A seventh outstanding characteristic of an excellent teacher of history is *competence in effective teaching,* which has been defined as the "process of modifying human behaviour through the creation of exciting learning experiences

---

[4] Edith West, "Selecting an Organization for a World History Course," *New Perspectives in World History;* edited by Shirley H. Engle (National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C., 1964), p. 586; Dancel F. McCall, "How History is Modified and Enriched by Other Disciplines," *ibid.*, pp. 569-584.

[5] Joan Doherty, "The History Component of the Elementary Social Studies Curriculum," *Social Education*, XXXII, No. 5, May 1968, p. 465.

[6] *Toward Excellence in College Teaching*, pp. 41-42.

[7] Richard E. Gross, "How to Handle Controversial Issues," (National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C. 1964), p. 4.

for children, pupils and students."[8]

The Attitude of the Teacher Towards the Learner

The Filipinos live in a dynamic but underdeveloped society, a society becoming more complex in view of progress in science and technology, rapid growth in population, changing economic structures and patterns, emergence of behavioral science and conflicts in values and ethics. Against these factors, the Filipinos are building a world of their own in relation to their cherished ideas of a free and democratic society.

1. It is clear then that the program of instruction in history, social sciences and social studies become the major vehicle which gives the learner an opportunity to continue his growth and development. The acquisition of knowledge and information, building of attitudes and appreciations and the development of skills can do much in meeting the needs, interest, goals, and problems of the youth.

2. In all learning process the student must be given GROWTH in:[9]

(1) Knowledge and information
(2) Attitudes and appreciations
(3) Skills
  (a) Work-study skills, such as reading and interpreting maps and the like
  (b) Thinking skills, such as critical thinking or problem-solving
  (c) Group-process skills, such as participating in group undertakings
  (d) Social-living skills, such as working in a group setting

3. In effective teaching, the teacher exerts all efforts in getting acquainted with the students in her class. All available sources of information about the learner are consulted. Through working with the students and observing them, much first-hand information about the students is obtained.

4. Acquaintance with educational studies on the physical,

---

[8] Leland H. Jacobs, *The Image of the Teacher,* N. E. A. Elementary Instructional Service, August, 1964.

[9] *Skill Development in Social Studies;* edited by Helen McCraken, (National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C., 1963), p. 18.

mental, and emotional characteristics of the youth will help the teacher direct their growth and development.

5. A teacher's enthusiasm for her work should not be dampened by the presence of the *slow learning group.* She should accept and meet the challenge of individual differences in the most feasible way.[10]

What the Student Expects from Studying History?

An important factor in the learning process is knowledge of the objectives of studying the subject. And an equally challenging factor in effective teaching is devising ways and means in accomplishing the objectives of the subject.

What Values Does History Give to the Student?

1. The student acquires a knowledge of the past which becomes useful in understanding the present.
2. The student gets a better understanding of human nature because he gets acquainted with how men acted in meeting their needs, goals, and problems.
3. Thinking is developed because the student learns the historical approach used by the historian as the student goes over men's recorded achievements in the past.
4. The student develops the skills of critical thinking, specially in making judgments.
5. A wiser and more realistic way of looking at every kind of human problem is developed in the student.
6. The study of history develops moral attitudes or strengthens the student's sentiment of virtue.
7. History develop responsible citizenship.
8. The student develops patriotism as he understands the role of national goals in the life of his country and people.[11]

Reminders and Practical Suggestions in Teaching History

It is not possible now to review the characteristics and effectiveness of all methods in teaching history, the social sciences and social studies. I shall, however, give some practical suggestions and useful reminders in teaching the subject. Some of them come from critical views of authors who have done studies on varied aspects of learning and social sciences and social studies. Some of them come from those who took part in conferences and seminars on the improvement of teaching and preparing instructional materials. Some of them come from cumulative experiences of successful teachers, instructors, and professors.

---

[10] Maurice P. Moffat, *Social Studies Instruction* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1963), pp. 54-63.

[11] Robert Y. Allen, “The Uses of History”, *Social Education, Elements of History* (Little, Hillard, Gray and Wilkins, 1831), pp. 3-12; Henry Johnson, *Teaching of History: In Elementary and Secondary Schools* (The Macmillan Co., New York, 1940), pp. 105-129; Paul Klapper, *The Teaching of History* (D. Appleton and Co., New York, 1926), pp. 25-114; Will and Ariel Durant, *The Lessons of History* (Simon and Schuster, New York, 1968), pp. 7-95.

What Is Methodology?

Methodology is a term that covers all activities in which the teacher participates while working toward the end of getting students to main access to the body of knowledge and skills for their growth and development.[12]

Methods are systematic approaches to learning so as to foster student growth and development. There are as many methods of teaching and, for all that we know, there may be just as many methods of learning.[13] "The best plan of instruction is that which utilizes a variety of methods and aids, each in situations and for purposes which it is best suited."[14]

Studies and experimentations have been made on the effectiveness of methods.[15] The results of numerous researches and studies on methods, techniques, procedures, and tools of learning reveal new and fresh viewpoints which enrich a teacher's experiences in teaching.

What Does the Creative History Teacher Do with Some Of the Results of the Studies and Researches on Methods?

The modern history teacher, like other teachers, utilizes various methods and techniques. She uses them according to her purposes of helping the learner grow and develop. She is aware of the fact that the effectiveness of instruction generally depends on the teacher's mastery of the learning process and the nature of the learner, mastery of the subject matter to be taught, and the skill in the use of the methods or techniques chosen by her.

---

[12] James High, *Teaching Secondary School Social Studies* (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1962), p. 160.

[13] Harry S. Broudy and John R. Palmer, *Exemplars of Teaching Method* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965), p. 8.

[14] Thomas F. Sovall, "Lecture vs. Discussion," *Social Education*, Vol. XX, No. 1 January, 1956, p. 12.

[15] Emily S. Girault and C. Benjamin Cox, "Review of Research in Social Studies," *Social Education*, XXXI, No. 5, May, 1967, pp. 388-395.

I firmly believe that it is possible for a teacher to be *creative* in teaching history if she is always desirous of improving her methods of instruction and enriching the materials for effective learning.[16]

The *creative teacher,* now and then, reads new ideas on the subject she is teaching to enrich the content of the subject. We have mentioned the need of getting acquainted with UNESCO's global history of mankind. UNESCO has sponsored another monumental work—*History of Africa.* The work expects to fill an important gap in our knowledge of Africa.[17]

She reads the results of studies, experiments, and researches and tries those ideas which she thinks can enrich or improve not only the content of the subject but also the methods she uses. A fresh approach, for instance, in dealing with international understanding may be achieved by the teacher by going over the recommendations of two conferences convened by UNESCO in improving content and the methods of teaching.[18] And she may also get a new point of view in teaching history with the objective of promoting international understanding by getting acquainted with the recommendations and conclusions of the seminar called by UNESCO in the summer of 1956. Seventy teachers from 32 different countries who attended the seminar discussed the problems of subject matter, syllabus and methods of teaching history with the end in view of promoting international understanding.[19]

---

[16] A. Miel, *Creativity in Teaching Invitations and Instances* (Wadsworth Publishing Co., California, 1961), p. 1; *Current Research on Instruction*; edited by Richard C. Anderson (Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1969).

[17] K. Onwuka Dike, "The Scientific Study of Africa's History", *The Unesco Courier,* January, 1967, pp. 9-15.

[18] "The Treatment of Asia in Western Textbooks and Teaching Materials," *Unesco Courier*, October 1956; "The Treatment of the West in Textbooks and Teaching Materials of South and East Asia," *Unesco Courier*, November, 1958.

[19] C. P. Hill, *Suggestions on the Teaching of History* (UNESCO, Paris, 1953).

She plans, too, her methods of approaches along reasonable suggestions about the learner and the learning process. She constantly evaluates what she teaches to improve her methods.

The Development of Skills Is Paramount

Today much attention is paid in the development of skills which may be defined as "ways of doing-well a variety of things."[20] Skills are basic tools of learning. And if the teaching of history aims to help students become responsible citizens, it can do much in attaining this goal by giving more opportunities to them in developing (1) work-study skills, such as locating and acquiring information, (2) intellectual skills, such as organizing and evaluating information useful in critical thinking and problem-solving, (3) group-process skills, such as those involved in leading or participating in group undertakings, and (4) social-living skills, such as living and working with groups.

What Does Research Say on the Development of Skills?

An interesting research work done for a well-known American council for the social studies gives many useful materials on the development and evaluation of skills. Among the important ideas presented in the development of skills, the following are significant in the improvement of methods of teaching:[21]

1. There is a need for a planned program for teaching skills because incidental learning of skills does not produce efficient skills in a modern democratic society.
2. A planned program for skill development is needed to provide appropriate gradation of the experiences of the students with various skills.
3. A graded sequence of skill development is needed since no skill or set of skills is learned in one experience. Opportunities should be provided so that the students can use skills repeatedly in different situations. When this is done system-

---

[20] *Handbook for Social Studies Teaching* (The Association of Teachers of Social Studies of the City of New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1967), p. 179.

[21] *Skill Development in Social Studies,* pp. 296-309.

atically, skills become a part of the equipment of the student in learning.

4. The skills must be employed at increasingly mature levels, as the student deals with complex situations. An illustration of this is the development of skills in critical thinking in situations that increase in difficulty.

5. A planned program for teaching and learning skills is needed to help the student make optimum transfer of his skill so that it becomes part of his customary behavior.

The Role of the Teacher of History in Developing Skills

The teacher in planning her lessons must provide a series of experiences that are conducive to the growth of skills. The experiences must be selected in terms of immediate situation. The skills should be developed as part of the daily course of learning the content of the lesson. The student must understand the meaning and purpose of the skill. The teacher must give the inspiring motivation for the development of the skills. The ability and maturity of the student must be taken into consideration. Repetitive practice in meaningful situations is essential in the successful learning and retention of the skills.

The Development of Critical Thinking Is Indispensable In Teaching History

When we apply our mind to a problem, it is called analysis of a problem, problem-solving, reflective thinking, critical thinking or scientific thinking.

What does research say on the development of critical thinking?

Research says that there are two components of effective thinking. The first is critical thinking in which the individual *does correct assessment of statements*. Questions are clarified and tested in this kind of thinking. The second is creative thinking in which the person becomes curious and forms hypotheses. On the basis of the assembled data, a person who is creative produces novel ideas or original solutions. The person who is creative in thinking is likely to be highly capable of critical thinking.[22]

The Role of the Teacher in the Development Of Creative Thinking

Creative thinking requires a good climate for its development. The teacher must give all the opportunities to the students in developing their imaginative ideas, divergent thinking, and exploring the results of novel suggestions. Teachers who welcome ideas, permit students to express them without fear of being penalized and respect the ideas produced by them will go a long way in developing creativeness in thinking.[23]

Among the skills identified in critical thinking are:

1. The skills of understanding
    - (a) Ability to summarize
    - (b) Sensitivity to new, ambiguous or specialized words
    - (c) Ability to detect bias
    - (d) Ability to assess competence
    - (e) Ability to judge the validity of data and their sources
    - (f) Ability to identify strong and weak arguments
    - (g) Ability to develop analogies
    - (h) Ability to distinguish fact and opinion
2. The skills of stating the problem of hypothesizing
    - (a) Ability to perceive possible solutions and state them as tentative solutions
    - (b) Ability to detect material or intellectual problems in social studies materials
    - (c) Ability to identify different types of generalizations
3. The skills of exploration
    - (a) Identification of assumptions
    - (b) Ability to develop valid inferences and trace logical implications
    - (c) Recognition of dogmatism or emotion

---

[22] Byron G. Massialas and Andreas M. Kazamias, *Crucial Issues in the Teaching of Social Studies* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., Jersey, Fair, Fannie R. Shaffel), National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D. C., 1967, pp. 115-116, 120; Byron G. Massiales and Frederick R. Smith, *New Challenges in the Social Studies* (Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., California, 1965), pp. 99-101.

[23] *Effective Thinking in the Teaching of Social Studies*, pp. 120, 235, 237.

   - (d) Ability to seek and utilize evidence
4. The skills concluding
   - (a) Ability to accept, modify, or reject a hypothesis
   - (b) Ability to develop solutions and consensus on solutions

The Role of the Teacher in Developing Critical Thinking

The teacher's role in critical thinking follows:

(1) The teacher must frame significant questions to help the student think critically. (2) She must utilize problems that will stir thinking and thought-provoking discussion. (3) She must guide the students in framing their own questions so that they develop the skills on how to think critically.[24]

Evaluation of critical thinking is important in the growth of the skills being developed by the teacher.

What does research say?

There are various ways of measuring competence or fitness in critical thinking. The teacher must test the following basic skills in critical thinking: (1) Identifying the central issue. (2) Identifying basic assumption. (3) Evaluating evidence. (4) Determining whether or not conclusions are warranted.[25]

The Role of the Teacher in Testing Critical Thinking

The construction of an objective test of the multiple-choice type can measure many skills of critical thinking, such as thought, insight, and understanding.[26]

The teacher should formulate essay questions that can test many skills in critical thinking. She can make a good analysis of classroom discussion to see the effectiveness of critical thinking. It is important to remember that the recording of teacher-student dialogue reveals good information on thought processess. This is certainly one of the significant and unique features of recent educational research.[27]

---

[24] R. H. Ennis, "A Concept of Critical Thinking," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXXII, No. 1 (Winter, 1962), pp. 83-84.

[25] *Evaluation in Social Studies, op. cit.*, p. 91.

[26] Henry Chauncey, *Multiple-Choice Questions: A Close Look* (Educational Testing Service, New Jersey, 1963).

The Need for a Study of Controversial Issues

The teaching of controversial issues is part of the study of history, social sciences and social studies for the heart of a democratic society is the resolving of conflicts. As individuals and groups grapple with problems, they work out their differences and decisions. The social sciences, specially history, offers many opportunities in the development of skills in critical thinking which help students arrive at patterns of thought or decisions. Throughout life the student will meet issues to which he must react. Developing life-long habits and attitude in resolving controversial issues helps much in making the student face the realities of everyday living.

What Does Research Say on Handling Controversial Issues?

Many books on the teaching of social sciences and social studies stress the importance of teaching controversial issues. They give valuable suggestions in handling them in the classroom.[28]

There are several criteria in the selection of issues for class study.

In the selection of issues for class study, consideration should be given on the policy of the government, the school, and the community on discussion of controversial issues.

If there is a permissive policy, the following criteria have been suggested by several studies:

1. Is the issue socially significant and timely?
2. Is the issue appropriate to the academic level and maturity of the students?
3. Is the issue of interest to the students?
4. Are materials available and understandable?

---

[27] *Effective Thinking in the Social Studies*, p. 238.

[28] Richard E. Gross, "How to Handle Controversial Issues," *How to do it series no. 14* (National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D. C., 1964): Harold A. Anderson, "Controversial Issues in the Schools," *The School Review*, Vol. 59, September, 1951, pp. 321-323; John H. Haefner, "The Historical Approach to Controversial Issues," *Social Education*, VI, October, 1942, pp. 267-269.

5. Is there adequate time in the study of the issue?
6. Is the issue related to the aims of the subject or course?
7. Is the teacher prepared to handle the issue from a personal and unbiased position?
8. Is the discussion of the issue one which will clash with community customs and attitudes?

What Is the Teacher's Role in Handling Controversial Issues?

Controversial issues can be handled in various ways. A developmental lesson, committee approach, open forum discussion, panel technique, debate, and the individual and group reporting techniques may be used.

The role of the teacher and her obligations may be summarized:[29]

She has to plan the work in handling the discussion of the issue by using the above criteria in selecting the issue for discussion. She has to introduce skillfully the issue for discussion so that the students will understand the objectives of the study and their implications. She has to help the students in planning the methods to be used in studying the problem. If the problem requires the use of the steps in problem-solving it pays much on the part of both teachers and students to review the steps in problem-solving. "Some of the greatest hurdles to overcome in aiding students to think through controversial questions lie in helping the students to gain an understanding of just why they hold a given position, the possible fallacies involved, and in aiding them to understand opposing views and their bases. The alert teacher regularly encourages his students to write frank answers behind questions, such as the following What are all the reasons behind my viewpoint? Why do I find this position most satisfying? How can I prove it is the best? What are the strong points of the other argument? Just why do my protagonists hold their view?[30]

---

[29] "How To Handle Controversial Issues," op. cit., pp. 1-7; Fraser-West. *Social Studies in Secondary Schools,* The Ronald Press Co., New York, 1961, pp. 247-248.

[30] "How to Handle Controversial Issues," *op. cit.,* p. 5.

What Are the Other Responsibilities of the Teacher As a Friendly Moderator in the Discussion of the Issue?

During the discussion she should help the group keep the discussion centered on the point at issue. When emotions rise, she should help maintain calm. She must see to it that all major points are discussed by the class. And she should see that all sides have equal opportunities to present their views.

Should the teacher express her opinion? There is no general rule that can be given. When the class requests the teacher to give her opinion during the discussion of the issue, it is best that she reserves its expression when the discussion has ended and everyone has expressed his opinion. She should label her opinion as opinion and explain the reasons on why she arrived at it.[31]

---

[31] *Social Studies in Secondary Schools, op. cit.*, p. 248; Morris R. Lwesnstein, *Teaching Social Studies in Junior and Senior High Schools* (Rand McMally & Co., Chicago, 1963), p. 372.

The Rewriting of Philippine History*

Gregorio F. Zaide

CONTEMPORARY EVENTS, surging like the tides of the seas, have wrought tremendous changes in the life and ethos of our nation. These changes necessitate the revision of our educational system in order to keep it attuned to the new spirit of our time, the promulgation of a new constitution to replace the colonial-oriented and outmoded Constitution of Commonwealth vintage, the Filipinization of our overly Westernized culture so that our people may regain their Asian soul, and last, but not the least, the rewriting of our history.

REASONS FOR REWRITING OUR HISTORY

There are five vital reasons why we need to rewrite Philippine history. First, as a free and sovereign nation, we should write a new history of our country and people—a history of, for, and by Filipinos.

Second, within the purview of any sound philosophy of history, every generation writes its own history. Our generation must, therefore, have a history that shall reflect its restless spirit, its demand for reforms in government and society, and its passionate yearning for better life.

Third, the errors or inaccuracies which have long been enshrined in our published history books must be corrected.

---

* Paper read in the First Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at the Bicol University, Legaspi City, on August 28, 1971.

These are errors of omission or commission, wittingly or unwittingly committed by historians.

Fourth, there still exist many gaps in our recorded history caused either by lack of source materials or by inadequate knowledge of historians. These gaps must be filled up to broaden our historical knowledge.

Finally, it is high time that we interpret our historical facts from the Filipino point of view. Ours is, indeed, a glorious history that we should be proud of. It is a many-splendored saga which rhapsodizes the emergence of a brown nation from colonial bondage to freedom.

HISTORY OF, FOR, AND BY FILIPINOS

Most of the history books on our country during the last four centuries of our colonial period were written by foreigners; consequently, they were either Hispano-centric or Yankee-oriented in perspective. Those authored by Spanish writers, such as Father Chirino (Jesuit), Father San Agustin (Augustinian), Father Santa Ines (Franciscan), Dr. Morga, Señor Montero y Vidal, and Señor Retana, were heavily spiced with Hispanism; and those penned by American authors, including Jernegan, Barrows, Katherine Mayo, and Worcester, were densely flavored with Americanism. Invariably, those history books scribbled by Spanish writers were apparently a history of Spain in the Philippines, and those written by American authors were ostensibly a history of America in the Philippines. None of these foreign-written books really narrate the history of the Philippines. They do not portray the soul of the Filipino people.

Xenophobia aside, it may be adduced with certitude that no foreigner, no matter how scholarly and wise he is, can produce a comprehensive, authentic, and reliable Philippine history. Only a Filipino—born of Filipino parents, reared on Philippine soil, and Malayan in blood—can feel sincerely the heartbeats of the Filipino people and passionately appreciate their aspiration and destiny. Hence, only a Filipino historian may be able to write a genuine Philippine history. As Dr. Jose Rizal, our greatest genius and hero, asseverated: "We are the only ones who can acquire a perfect knowledge of our country because we know the native languages and besides we are informed of the secrets of our people among whom we had been raised."[1] This Rizalian dictum is confirmed by Dr. G. P. Gooch, a prestigious American historian, who said: "Historians, like other peoples, speak with special authority on the land of their birth."[2]

The second reason why we should rewrite Philippine history is because historical works written in bygone years no longer reflect the spirit of our time. By and large, they are, in certain respects, obsolete in perspective, inadequate in contemporary materials, and woefully outmoded in scholarship.

As time marches on, the history of mankind changes. History written in the past, in large measure, may not be valid today; and history written today would also lose much of its validity in the future. There are lots of things to be recorded, generation after generation, and as events roll year in and year out, the people's perspective changes. Thus commented Dr. Allan Nevins:

> As mankind lengthens its records, perspective steadily changes. The lenses through which we look at the past must be refocused from generation to generation. What seemed wisdom to our fathers is often folly to us; what is intensely dramatic to our age may seem naive or banal to the next. While the best history is perdurable, there is a sense in which every generation needs to have history rewritten anew for it; and in this fact lies much of the challenge and fascination which historical activity will always have to thoughtful men. The history written in any age insensibly bodies forth the form and spirit of that age; a succession of histories is a record of the stages through which thought and feelings have passed.[3]

CORRECTING THE ERRORS IN HISTORY BOOKS

To correct the errors or inaccuracies in history books published in the past is another reason why our history should be rewritten. Historians are human beings; they are not infallible like gods. As human beings they naturally commit mistakes in their writings, for which human frailty they should be forgiven. As Pope once said with Christian charity: "To err is human; to forgive divine."

---

[1] Rizal to the Filipinos of Barcelona, London, January, 1899. See *Rizal's Correspondence with Fellow Reformists* (Manila, 1963), Vol. II, p. 254.

[2] *Studies in German History* (New York, 1948), p. 210.

[3] *The Gateway to History* (New York, 1938), p. 21.

Our historians today can certainly push the frontiers of historical knowledge by correcting these errors which have been masquerading for many years in published books as historical truths. To rectify them now, is, by all means, a forward step towards good historiography. According to an eminent Argentine scholar, Dr. Enrique Gandia, it is proper for every scholar "to correct his predecessors."[4] Blind acceptance of what former authors wrote, as if their assertions were infallible dogmas, is contrary to sound scholarship and inimical to truth.[5]

Historians should not resent to have their mistakes corrected, and those who make the corrections should not gloat with Mephistophelean glee. To accept one's mistakes in good grace is a sterling quality of a real scholar. After all, no scholar in the world can claim to know everything under the sun or to possess perfect wisdom. Even Dr. Rizal, peerless genius of our race, committed blunders in his writings as follows:

1. In a letter to Felix Resurreccion Hidalgo in 1887, he said that he took the title of his first novel *Noli Me Tangere* from the Gospel of St. Luke. He was wrong because the words "Noli Me Tangere" (Touch Me Not) are in the Gospel of St. John, Chapter 20, Verse 17.
2. Rizal bungled the exact date of the Cavite Mutiny and the ages of Fathers Gomez, Burgos and Zamora in his famous dedicatory note of his second novel *El Filibusterismo*. He wrote: "To the memory of the priests, Don Mariano Gomez (85 years old—sic. 73), Don Jose Burgos (30 years old—sic. 35), and Don Jacinto Zamora (35 years old—sic. 37).
3. In one of his annotations to Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (Paris, 1891 edition) he called Hideyoshi "Emperor of Japan." This is erroneous because Hideyoshi was neither emperor nor shogun. Owing to his plebeian ancestry he could only have assumed the titles of *Kwambacu* (Regent) and *Taiko* (Tycoon).

Rectification of errors and fallacies in printed books must be done in good taste, devoid of malice and unpolluted by sadistic rancor. It should not be vulgarized into muckraking or debunking. The errors must be proved beyond cavil of doubt by means of impeccable documentation, obtained through "scrupulous research and authentic documentation."[6] In the perceptive opinion of Lord Acton: "History, to be above evasion or dispute, must stand on documents, not opinions."[7]

---

[4] *La Revision de la historia Argentina* (Buenos Aires, 1952), p. 7.

[5] "Blind submission to what were written by previous historians and acceptance without question of their assertions," remarked Dr. Gabriel Garcia, noted Ecuadorian scholar, "are precisely unhistorical and uncritical". (*Reflexiones sobre la historia de Ecuador*, Cuenca 1957, p. 11.)

An example of a serious error in various printed history books in former years is the popular concept that the *encomienda* during Spanish time was a land grant; hence it was the origin of the *hacienda* (landed estate) of modern times. A more critical reading of the *Recopilación de Leyes de los Reynos de las Indias* (Madrid, 1681), particularly Ley i, Titulo VIII, Libro VI, Ley iii, Titulo I, Libro VI, Ley xi, Titulo VIII, Libro VI, Ley iii, Titulo VIII, Libro VI, and Ley viii, Titulo XI, Libro VI, vividly shows that the *encomienda* Spain granted to her colonizers as a reward for their services pertained only to the tributes paid by the conquered inhabitants who were "encommended" or placed under the protection of a Spanish colonizer or *encomendero*. Proprietary ownership of the land or territory, where the inhabitants lived, was not included in the royal grant. In other words, the *encomendero* simply received the tributes paid by the conquered inhabitants. This was confirmed by knowledgeable authorities on Spanish colonization, such as Wilhelm Roscher (German),[8] C. H. Haring[9] (American), R. S. Chamberlain[10] (British), F. A. Kirpatrick[11] (British), Lesley Byrd Simpson[12] (American), and Silvio A. Zavala[13] (Mexican).

Another popular concept in our historiography which should be corrected is the alleged vassalage of the Philippines to the

---

[6] Matthew A. Firtzimons, Alfred G. Pundt, and Charles E. Nowell, *The Development of Historiography* (Harrisburg, Pa., 1954), p. 81.

[7] "The Philosophy of History", *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* (London, 1939-1940), p. 157.

[8] *The Spanish Colonial System* (New York, 1904), pp. 4-5. Translated by Edward Gaylord Bourne.

[9] *The Spanish Empire in America* (New York, 1947), pp. 44-45, 51, 62.

[10] *Castilian Backgrounds of the Repartimiento*—(Encomienda. Reprint of the Carnegie Institute of Washington Publication No. 509, June, 1939, *passim*.

[11] *The Spanish Conquistadores* (London, 1934), pp. 121-123.

[12] *The Encomienda in New Spain* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1950), pp. 129-132.

[13] Vide "La propiedad territorial en las encomiendas de Indias", *Universidad* (Mexico, D. F., September, 1937), pp. 34-37. See also *New Viewpoints on the Spanish Colonization of America* (Philadelphia, 1943), pp. 80-84.

Srivijaya and Madjapahit Empires, two Indianized Malay empires that had dominated the Southeast Asian world from the 7th to the 15th century A. D. This concept was popularized in 1921 by the late Professor H. Otley Beyer[14] and was accepted by his contemporaries and former students. Evidently, Beyer, more of an anthropologist than a historian, was misled by the the Javanese epic poem *Nagarakertagama*,[15] written in 1365 by Rakawi Prapanca, an Indonesian priest-poet, and by Thomas Stamford Raffles' book *The History of Java*, first published in London in 1817 in two volumes.

In his epic poem, Prapanca extolled the splendor of Madjapahit Empire (which had absorbed the Srivijaya Empire in the 14th century) and claimed Emperor Hayam Wuruk (1350-1389) ruled over 94 vassal states, including *Solot* and *Saludung*. Professor Beyer guessed that *Solot* was Sulu in the Philippines. The late President Sukarno, in his address at the Far Eastern University (Manila) on February 9, 1951, on the occasion of his investiture as Doctor of Laws (honoris causa) boldly asserted that Saludung was the Philippines.

Both Beyer and Sukarno were wrong in their assumptions. In 1951, the epic poem *Nagarakertagama* was exposed by Dr. C. D. Berg, renowned Dutch authority on Indonesia, as a fabulous myth in the resplendent garb of history.[16] In other words, Prapanca's chauvinistic claim of the greatness of the so-called Majapahit Empire was a figment of the imagination. Research findings made by European and Indonesian scholars in recent years show that *Solot* in Prapanca's poem refers to either *Solot*, an ancient name for a region northwest of Brunei in Borneo or Solot, one of the little islands in the Lesser Sundas.[17]

---

[14] "The Philippines Before Magellan", *Asia*, New York, October-November 1921. See also H. Otley Beyer and Jaime C. de Veyra, *Philippine Saga* (Manila, 1947) pp. 17-26.

[15] *Nagarakertagama* was first published in Balinese language by J. L. A. Brandeis in 1902. It was translated into Dutch by J. H. C. Kern and published at The Hague in 1919. Later it was translated into English by Theodore Pigeaud and published in five volumes by Martinus Nijhoff at The Hague in 1960.

[16] "De Sadeng-oorlog en de mythe van Groot Majapahit", *Indonesia*. (The Hague, 1951), Vol. V, pp. 385-422.

[17] Elizabeth L. Hassel, "The Sri-Vijayan and Majapahit Empires and the Theory of their Political Association with the Philippines", *Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review* (Queon City, March, 1953), Vol. XVIII, No. 1, p. 68.

Stamford Raffles, who was a better empire-builder than a historian, asserted in his book that prior to 1478 a Majapahit general named Peng'ging conquered Manila and other lands in Southeast Asia.[18] His claim should not be given credence because it was based solely on Javanese *babads* (folk traditions). Because these *babads* are of dubious history, as E. S. de Klerck (Dutch scholar) affirmed, the alleged conquest of Manila (which Beyer believed to be the present city of Manila) was fictional. Moreover, it should be noted that the "Manila" mentioned by Raffles' book could be Manila, a place on the northwest coast of Madura Island[19]—not the early kingdom of Maynilad at the shore of Manila Bay.

The truth of the matter is that until the present day no prestigious historian can present any historical or archaeological evidence to prove that the Philippines had been conquered and ruled by either Srivijaya or Majapahit Empire.

FILLING IN THE GAPS IN PHILIPPINE HISTORY

The fourth reason for rewriting Philippine history is the urgent necessity of filling in the gaps in our recorded history. To do so is the bounded duty of Filipino historians. Unless this is done, our knowledge of the history of our nation will remain incomplete, fragmentary—like an unfinished symphony of a great composer.

The first major gap in our historical knowledge is the pre-Magellanic period, that is, the dim centuries preceding the coming of Magellan in 1521. Spanish chroniclers presumed that Philippine history began only in 1521 when Magellan "discovered" the Philippines and that the Filipinos then were "uncivilized barbarians." Now we know that this Hispanic concept is a historical fantasy. Throughout the three long centuries of Spanish rule, Iberian writers harped on this misleading and inaccurate view of Philippine history. Only one Spanish writer, Raimundo Geler, dared to challenge its validity. From his extensive reading of old Oriental manuscripts, he found out that the Arabs, Indians, Chinese, and Japanese, visited Philippine shores long before the advent of Magellan. He wrote a book entitled *Las Islas Filipinas*[20] (Madrid, Imprenta a Cargo de J. E. Morete, 1869), in which he blasted the fallacious concept of the Spanish historians regarding pre-Magellanic Philippines. Unfortunately, this Geler book was banned by the Spanish authorities so that it is extremely rare now.

---

[18] *The History of Java* (London, 1817), Vol. II, p. 121.

[19] See the map of Southeast Asia in Soedjatmoko et al (editors); *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography* (Ithaca, New York 1965), p. 1.

Today Filipino historians, with the aid of recent archaeological discoveries and research findings among the ancient records of India, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, and other Asian countries, are beginning to know more of our country's dim past. They must delve deeper into the obscure centuries of our pre-Magellanic period and try their best to salvage more fragments of historical lore from oblivion. As W. H. Walsh remarked in his essay *Meaning of History*: "Dark as many of the details of past happenings are and obscure as are their connections, it is at any rate the aim of historians to lessen the darkness and remove the obscurity; in a word, to make the past as intelligible as it can be made."[21]

Both archaeological excavations and historical researches in the Philippines and the neighboring Asian countries in recent years have truly broadened our knowledge of pre-Spanish Philippines. For instance, the crude stone tools and skeletal remains of extinct types of animals and human beings discovered in various archaeological sites throughout the archipelago disclose that "man first appeared in the Islands some 250,000 to 300,000 years ago during the Middle Pleistocene".[22] The ancient burial jars, earthen pots, porcelain wares, and other artifacts excavated by archaeologists in the Babuyan Islands, Calatagan (Batangas Province), Bato Caves near Bacon in Sorsogon Province, Tabon Caves in Palawan, and in other parts of our archipelago reveal the existence of pre-Hispanic culture and attest to the fact that our ancestors traded with and carried on cultural relations with China, India, Arabia, Japan, Cambodia, Thailand, Vietnam, and other neighboring Asian countries. This is confirmed by the ancient history records of India, China, and Arabia and by the early traditional accounts of Java, Sumatra, Borneo, and other countries of the Malaysian world.

---

[20] Dr. Rizal had read this book by Geler in London while he was busy annotating Morga's *Sucesos* at the British Museum and was very much impressed by it. Writing to Professor Blumentritt from London, October 13, 1888, he said: "It says much truth; if there were only 50 Spaniards like Geler, I will give and shed my last drop of blood for Spain," (*Epistolario Rizalino*, Vol. V, Part I, p. 317.) Evidently, Dr. Pedro A. Paterno had also read Geler's book, for he quoted it extensively in the last pages of his novel *Ninay* which was published in Madrid, 1885, pp. 343-352, Appendix D.

[21] See Patrick Gardiner (editor), *Theories of History* (Glencoe, Illinois, 1959), p. 296.

[22] Robert B. Fox, *The Philippines in Pre-Historic Times* (Manila, 1959), p. 8.

Another noticeable gap in Philippine history is the little-known century, from 1660-1760. This particular period is fragmentarily explored in our history books. As Dr. Edgar B. Wickberg noticed: "Most of the research done has been concentrated on the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries."[28] Earlier scholars, notably Father Pablo Pastells (Spanish Jesuit) and Dr. James A. Robertson (American historian), who conducted less intensive researches in the archives of European countries did not accomplish much beyond the year 1660. Our scholars today should carry on the unfinished labors of Pastells and Robertson. To do this, they should go abroad and search for Filipiniana materials in the New York Public Library (New York City), Library of Congress and National Archives (Washington, D.C.), Newberry Library (Chicago), Archivo General de la Nacion (Mexico City), British Museum (London), Bibiioteque Nationale (Paris), Arquivo Nacional de Torre de Tombo (Lisbon), Archivo General de Indias (Seville), Archivo General de Valladolid, Archivo Historico Nacional (Madrid), Vatican Archives and Library (Vatican City), Biblioteca Ambrosiana (Milan), Raffles Museum (Singapore), and other foreign repositories of historical documents and books.

Certain aspects of the Spanish colonial system in the Philippines require further study by Filipino historians. For example, many of our present history books do not mention the *pancada* and the *vandala.* The term *pancada* refers to the system of collective bargaining with the Chinese traders under the supervision of a committee of Manila traders appointed by the Spanish governor-general. This system was established in order to protect the interests of the Spanish and Filipino merchants who were usually outwitted by the astute Chinese merchants in individual bargaining. *Vandala* was the forcible sale of native products, particularly rice, to the government at a price fixed by the Spanish officials. In the 17th century the *vandala* became a notorious source of Spanish abuses, because the corrupt officials commandeered from the rural folks rice, coconut oil, wine, and other farm products, without paying for them, or if payment was given it was woefully below the market price.

---

[28] *Vide* "Spanish Records in the Philippine National Archives", *Hispanic American Historical Review;* Vol. XXXV, No. 1, p. 80.

Writing in 1679, Fray Martin Fernandez de Navarrete, Dominican priest-writer, lamented the prevalence of the *vandala*. According to him, the Pampanga revolt in 1660 under Maniago's leadership was caused by the failure of the government to pay Pampangan farmers for the rice commandeered by the Spanish authorities.[24]

Another phase of our history which requires further exploration by Filipino historians pertains to our relations with Latin America during Hispanic times. We know quite well that the Philippines was ruled by Spain through Mexico (Nueva España) from 1565 to 1821, during which many galleons crossed the Pacific, thereby linking Manila and Acapulco. After the year 1821, Philippine-Mexican relations ceased suddenly because the Mexicans won their independence from Spain.

Now is the time for our historians to enlighten the readers of Philippine history on the following topics:

1. Mexico's contributions to Philippine history and civilization.
2. Philippine contributions to Mexican history and civilization.
3. The role of the Inquisition in Philippine history.
4. The outflow of the Manila goods ferried by the galleons from Acapulco to Panama, Guatemala, Colombia, Ecuador, Chile, Peru, and Argentina.
5. The coming of the Mexicans, Guatemalans, Argentines, Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and other Latin Americans to the Philippines during colonial times.
6. The story of the Filipino sailors who deserted the gal-

---

[24] *Tratados historicos, politicos, ethicos y religiosos de la monarchia de Chinc* (Madrid, 1676), Chapter IV.

leons in Acapulco and married Mexican women.
7. The role of the Philippines in the War of Mexican Independence (1810-1821).

During my seven trips to Mexico, from 1957 to 1966, I was fortunate to befriend many Mexican scholars who helped me obtain valuable Filipiniana materials in the government archives and in private collection. Two valuable documents on Philippine-Mexican relations which fascinated me very much, because they were unknown to Filipino historians, are (1) the secret memorandum of the first Mexican Empire under Emperor Iturbide I, dated December 29, 1821, and (2) the letter of Pedro de Escura (Filipino) to President Benito Juarez of the Republic of Mexico, dated December 1859.[25]

The first document—the secret memorandum of the First Mexican Empire—was addressed to the Filipino people, urging them to rise in arms against Spain and win their independence like what the Mexicans did. Once Philippine independence was achieved, the Mexican government would restore the galleon trade and welcome Filipino immigrants to Mexico. Unfortunately, this documents was not transmitted to Manila for two reasons: (1) at that time (1821) Spain, angered by the loss of Mexico, cut off all means of communication and transportation between Mexico and the Philippines; and (2) there was no Filipino leader, then of the stature of Rizal, Bonifacio, or General Emilio Aguinaldo who could lead a revolution in the Philippines.

The second document—the unpublished letter of Pedro de Escura—was addressed to President Juarez. On behalf of his father, Antonio de Escura, a Filipino galleon trader of Manila, Don Pedro requested President Juarez to order the release of the funds which the Mexican Congress had previously approved as indemnity for the chests containing 525,000 silver pesos commandeered by General Iturbide in 1821 in Chilpancingco, near Acapulco. These treasure chests belonged to the Manila merchants, including Antonio de Escura. At that time the fate of the Mexican Revolution was hanging in a balance due to shortage of funds. The Mexican army under

---

[25] Typescript copies of these two valuable documents on Philippine-Mexican relations are in the G. F. Zaide Filipiniana Collection.

Iturbide's command was on the verge of mutiny owing to unpaid salaries and shortage of provisions. To keep his army intact, General Iturbide confiscated the shipment of silver pesos which was then carried by a burro train from Mexico City to Acapulco. Part of this confiscated money belonged to Don Antonio de Escura, whose goods were sold in Mexico City. There is no gainsaying the fact that the silver pesos commandeered by Iturbide contributed to the success of the Mexican War of Independence. Years later, Pedro de Escura was sent by his father to Mexico via Spain in order to seek reparations for his confiscated silver treasure. Don Pedro failed to recover the family losses, but succeeded in marrying a pretty Mexican lady. He stayed permanently in Mexico, where his descendants are still living.

More gaps in Philippine history worthy of mention are (1) the origin and story of the Filipino colony called St. Malo near New Orleans, Louisiana, U.S.A., still existing today; (2) the stirring tale of the valiant Filipinos, called "Manila Men", who fought under the command of the American adventurer Frederick Townshend Ward in 1860 and helped the Manchu emperor of China suppress the formidable Taiping Rebellion;* and (3) the role played by the Filipino troops in the French conquest of Vietnam in 1858-1884.

Other gaps in our recorded history can be filled up by compiling our regional histories, that is, the town chronicles and provincial histories. There are abundant materials in these local histories[26] which historians may utilize in rewriting our national history. During his administration (1909-13) Governor-General W. Cameron Forbes encouraged the compiling of the histories of our towns and provinces. The typescript manuscripts of these local histories were carefully preserved in the National Library. Lamentably, they were burned, together with the priceless Filipiniana collections of our National Library, during the horrendous days of the liberation of Manila by the forces of General Douglas MacArthur in February, 1945. After the war, the Bureau of Public Schools and the National Library exerted renewed efforts to compile these materials. Our historians can profit now by consulting them.

---

* Cf. Charles J. McCarthy, S.J., "Manilamen Surprise Shanghai Stronghold," in *Historical Bulletin*, 1970, Vol. XIV, p. 249-272 (Ed.)

[26] Speaking of the importance of local histories in a nation's historiography, Sir Steve Runciman, distinguished British historian remarked: "A purely local history of some village or some small institution can be of immense value, so long as its writer knows how to fit it into the general pattern and can indicate to his readers where it fits." (*The Study of World History*, Manila. Published by the University of the East, 1957, p. 4)

[27] *On the Philosophy of History* (New York, 1957), p. 8.

Some local histories have already been published. Among them are the *Reseña de la Provincia de Leyte* (1914) by Manuel Artigas y Cuerva; *Ang Malulos sa mga Dahon ng Kasaysayan* (1936) by Antonio Bautista and Jose P. Santos; *History of Aritao, Nueva Vizcaya* (1953) by Emilio Tolentino and Gregorio F. Zaide; *Kasaysayan at Tala ng Bayan ng Lukban* (1952) by Pantaleon Nantes; *Paete* (1956) by Eugenio C. Quesada; *Cagayan Province and Her People* (1960) by Ed de Rivera Castillet; *Majayjay* (1964) by Juan Palazon; and *Bohol and Its People* (1965) by Cecilio Putong.

INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY FROM THE FILIPINO VIEWPOINT

The last reason for rewriting our history is the urgent need of interpreting historical facts from the Filipino point of view. Historical works written by Spanish authors are generally pro-Hispanic in perspective and those penned by American writers are pro-American.

Today is the propitious time to interpret our history from the Filipino point of view. By purging our written history of the usual aroma of Hispanism and the flavor of Yankeeism, our historians can produce a comprehensive and genuine history of our country that is verily Filipinistic in perspective and philosophy. In writing such a history, great care should be taken by our historians not to allow themselves to be dazzled by jingoistic pride or be embittered by anti-foreign bias. In other words, they should try their best to be truthful, impartial, and fair in their appraisal or evaluation of historical facts. One can really love his fatherland without hating other nations. One can glorify the achievements of his nation without denigrating the achievements of other nations. And one can praise his own people without slandering other peoples. Truth must be the guiding star of our historians. As Jacques

Maritain, famed French philosopher, commented: "There is truth in history."[28]

The first thing to reinterpret in our history is the real role of Ferdinand Magellan in our historical saga. Western historians proudly hail him as the "discoverer" of the Philippines. This smacks of Europeo-centricism. The unvarnished truth is that he was the rediscoverer Long before he was ever born, our country was discovered by the Asian—by the Negritos who came and peopled our archipelago about 25,000 years ago, the Indonesians who came to our shores about 3000 B.C., and the Malays who came as early as 200 B.C. And centuries before Magellan, the Chinese, Indians, Arabs, Japanese, Cambodians, Javanese, Thais (Siamese), and other Asians already knew of the existence of the Philippines. Surely, the Negritos, Indonesians, Malays, Chinese, Indians, Arabs, and other Asians have a better claim to the title of "discoverers" than Magellan and other white explorers.

What Magellan really accomplished was to reduce the geographical ignorance of the European peoples and to give Spain the opportunity to extend Hispanic rule and Christian religion to the Asian world.

Filipino historians can justifiably glamorize Lapu-Lapu of Mactan, valiant conqueror of Magellan, as the first hero of the Philippines. His victory at Mactan was the first successful repulse of European aggression by Asian arms in Southeast Asia. By crushing Magellan, who was extolled by Western historians as a world conqueror, Lapu-Lapu can be acclaimed as a conqueror of a world conqueror.

Our misrepresentation in our history which sorely needs to be set aright by Filipino historians is the case of our Muslim brothers of the south, whom the Spaniards called "Moros."

---

[28] The presumptuous claim of the white men to have discovered lands already known to other races was lampooned by Dr. A. W. Slaten of Hawaii in the following words: "In nothing does the egoism of civilized men show itself more hilariously than in this matter of claiming to discover what less advanced peoples already know. What geographical exploration has really done has been to reduce the ignorance of the explorers. And the hoisting of an European flag and the taking over the new lands and their peoples in the name of some sovereign was sheer larceny on a grand scale." (*Vide* "Who Discovered Hawaii?" *The Honolulu Star Bulletin,* October 27, 1937.)

These liberty-loving and superbly courageous Muslim Filipinos were cruelly portrayed in Spanish writings as "barbarous infidels" and "savage pirates." The truth is that they were valiant defenders of their Islamic faith and freedom. For more than three centuries the Spaniards, with the aid of Christian Filipino auxiliaries, tried to conquer Mindanao and Sulu, but in vain. After the downfall of Spain in the Philippines, the Americans carried on the unfinished Western invasion of the Moroland. It is true that the fighting Muslim Filipinos were defeated in various battles by the superior American arms, but they were never conquered. Until now they are un-Hispanized and un-Americanized, Islamic in religion and loyal to their Asian heritage.

Spanish writers, with despicable Iberian arrogance, applied the derogatory term *Indio* (Indian) to brown-skinned Filipinos and regarded them as belonging to an "inferior race." They called the defenders of our liberties, including Dr. Rizal, M. H. del Pilar, G. Lopez Jaena, and Mariano Ponce, *filibusteros* and our fighting patriots, such as Andres Bonifacio, Emilio Jacinto, Emilio Aguinaldo, and their troops, *insurrectos*. These obnoxious Spanish terms—*Indios, filibusteros,* and *insurrectos*—should be deleted from our history books.

American historians were also guilty of maligning our people. They derisively dubbed the Malolos Republic, the first republic in Asia, as a "paper republic" or a "tin-horn government." Either out of ignorance or bias they refused to recognize the fact that this republic, which existed by the grace of God and with the whole-hearted support of the Filipino people from 1899 to 1901, had all the symbolic requirements of an independent and sovereign government, such as the formal declaration of independence, a national anthem, a national system of education, a national coat-of-arms, a diplomatic corps, a national army and navy.

American historians also called the War of Philippine Independence (1899-1902) as the "Philippine Insurrection" and called General Emilio Aguinaldo and our freedom fighters as "insurgents." Such Yankee assertion is deplorably unfair and unjust.

In the interpretation of our history, General Aguinaldo and his comrades-in-arms should be depicted as genuine patriots who fought for our people's God-given right to be free and sovereign, exactly like the glorified Yankees of 1776 who fought the War of American Independence against British rule.

THE CHALLENGE TO FILIPINO HISTORIANS

Considering the tremendous difficulties which our historians would have to overcome in rewriting the history of our nation, the question arises: "Will our historians undertake this herculean task?" This is a challenge which I sincerely believe they ought to accept. As warriors of the pen and as genuine Filipinos, they can not dare evade it with honor.

Inasmuch as the task of rewriting Philippine history is of stupendous magnitude, it behooves all historians of our country, irrespective of their varied philosophies of history, religious creeds, and socio-political status, to unite in a common and cooperative project and forget their petty jealousies, prudish animosities, and professional bickerings. For no single historian can write the complete, definitive, and veracious history of the Philippines. The task is a long-time job and requires many years of intensive research in local and foreign archives, indefatigable evaluation and appraisal of historical facts, and arduous weaving and harmonization of source-materials into a dramatic symphony of a nation's history. Whatever is to be left undone by this generation of historians, the next generation must carry on. For the history of any people cannot be written in one day or one year—it really takes many years of dedicated labor and patience.

In conclusion, it must be acknowledged that in the mighty task of nation-building, historians, as well as educators, scientists, artists, musicians, lawyers, politicians, and economists, play a significant role. Theirs is the paramount responsibility to record the events, achievements, and mistakes of our nation so that posterity may read and benefit by them. If there are no historians, all these things would vanish on the wings of time and future generations would thus have no glorious memories of their nostalgic past. Without historians, therefore, a nation will have no history. And a nation without history can never be great.

On the Rewriting of Philippine History *

Teodoro A. Agoncillo

THERE WAS A TIME, up to the 1960s to be definite, when the writing of Philippine history was seen through foreign eyes. It was natural for Spanish and, later, American historical writers and chroniclers to look at Philippine history from their perspective. The tragedy, however, was and still is that Filipino historians—or most of them—look at their history through Spanish and American eyes. One has only to leaf through their works to realize the extent of the "brain washing" they had undergone. One senses the presence of the colonial hangover that has been responsible for the twisting of the facts of our history. A little less than four hundred years of foreign domination in which the mind and the body had been conditioned to follow blindly the master's and not-too-subtle policies directed towards the attainment of their national and/or individual self-interests, cannot be banished with a wave of the hand or with an angry gesture. It takes courage and a strong dose of nationalism for the Filipinos to banish the bad effects of colonialism.

One of the most potent techniques used by colonizers to condition the minds of the colonials in such a way as to make them pliant and, therefore, easy to manage, is their writing of colonial history which is so colored that everything they

---

* Paper read in the Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at the Baguio Colleges, Baguio City, on May 27, 1972.

did in their colonies was ordained by Heaven. Read any colonial history written by a writer who belongs to the race of the colonizer and invariably one finds to one's amusement, if one has a sense of humor, or anger, if one takes oneself seriously, that the "natives" are indolent, unintelligent, treacherous, superstitious, disloyal, unhygienic, and such pejorative adjectives as are found in any dictionary. On the other hand, the colonizers are almost always humane, civilized, progressive, competent, efficient and such. Rarely does one find a colonizer-chronicler nodding in the direction of the "natives" with a naughty wink and saying that the latter, however, may have or are possessed of some redeeming qualities—clearly a sop to salve his conscience or whatever remains of it. This is the general trend which can be gleaned from the colonial history of the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaya, the former French Indo-China, and India. I am not blaming the chronicler-author for his one-sided approach to colonial historiography because, as I once said, the history of any country—whether colonial or independent—is seen from an angle where the author stands. But while I do not blame the chronicler-colonizer, I do blame the "natives" who, after independence, still think, act, and talk as if they are still colonials. Today, this colonial mentality is very much in evidence in the schools, colleges, and universities.

I do not want to appear fulsome, but I can say without blushing that I pioneered in the writing of Philippine history from the Filipino point of view. In the late 1940s, I lectured to my history and Tagalog classes on the necessity of rewriting our history in such a way as to view it from the Filipino standpoint and that the facts of our history must be re-evaluated in order to purge our textbooks of those misconceptions which have vitiated them for generations. In 1958, in a lecture delivered under the auspices of the Philippine chapter of Pi Gamma Mu, I repeated what I had been telling my students, namely, that our history must be seen through Filipino eyes and that Philippine history, rightly looked upon, began in 1872 when the Cavite Mutiny occurred which, in turn, led to the execution of the Filipino priests Gomez, Burgos, and Zamora which, in turn, led to the development of Filipino nationalism.* The so-called Philippine history before 1872 was not Filipino but Spanish, that is to say, the history of Spain in the Philippines. In 1960, as one of the speakers in the first Conference of the International Association of Historians of Asia, I said that we should go about reorienting our people by re-writing and re-interpreting our history from the point of view of the Filipino. This problem has been with us since nominal independence in 1946 and will fester like a malignant wound for some time to come owing to the persistence of colonial mentality among our people, even among the educated. Only through a radical revamp of our educational system which will emphasize Filipinism can colonial mentality be rooted out, perhaps not completely but almost completely.

Let me summarize briefly the history of our historiography up to the outbreak of the Second World War in order to understand why Filipino historians, by and large, have followed the footsteps of their former colonial masters. Up to the outbreak of the war in the Pacific in 1941, Philippine history was largely written by Spaniards and Americans. The Spanish missionaries who came to the Philippines with the *conquistadores* wrote the chronicles of their exploits in the Philippines and, at the same time, pictured the kind of society they found. Since they could not very well understand what they found, especially the religion of the natives, they based their judgments of things Philippine on their knowledge of Western society and its morals and made these their frame of reference. From Fathers Juan de Plasencia and Pedro Chirino to Fathers Felix de Huerta and Francisco Foradada, the Spanish chroniclers, with the exception of Antonio de Morga, who was a layman, suffered from Eurocentric disease in which all non-European scale of values, religions, societies and the like, were treated in a cavalier manner. The Spanish lay chroniclers, ably represented by José Montero y Vidal, Vicente Barrantes, Wenceslao E. Retana, and Pablo Feced, are not better than their ecclesiastical colleagues, perhaps worse. Their focus, quite understandably, was on the achievements of the Spaniards, especially the friars, and any

---

"A Re-Interpretation of Our History Under Spain," in *The Sunday Times Magazine*, 24 August 1958.

mention of the natives whom they called "indios", was done to furnish a contrast with the "self-effacing," "self-sacrificing," "humane," "industrious," and "kind" Spaniards, according to these chroniclers who were afflicted with Narcissus complex.

When the Americans supplanted the Spaniards in the Philippines they introduced their system of public education which, while advantageous to the Filipinos in some respects, was on the other hand, a terrible burden on the minds of the school boys and girls who learned not about Rizal, del Pilar, López Jaena, Bonifacio, and other Filipino heroes, but about Washington and the apocryphal cherry tree, about Lincoln, about snow, about Santa Claus, and all about Western concepts, values, and aesthetics which were totally alien to the experience of Filipino students. Even Philippine history textbooks were written by Americans, and the two most popular, namely, Jernegan and Barrows, became the bible of Filipino students. The effect of such kind of education, which continued up to the establishment of the Commonwealth in 1935 and even beyond, was such as to implant in the minds of the Filipino students a sense of inferiority, on one hand, and a sense of gratitude to the Americans, on the other. In a word, the Filipinos were taught to accept blissfully everything American and at the same time to thank their colonizers for the colonial status of the Philippines.

When we balance the Spanish colonial regime in the Philippines with that of the American, we find that the almost half a century of American occupation had done more good to the Filipinos than the more than three centuries of Spain in the Philippines. However, the Americans had done more damage, consciously or unconsciously, to the Filipinos in so short a period than the Spaniards had in more than three hundred years. The Americans introduced good roads, more bridges, automobiles and trucks, and such amenities of "civilized" life as the refrigerator, beauty parlor, soft drinks, and countless items, thus making life more comfortable, if a little bit exasperating. On the other hand, the introduction of American automobiles and trucks compelled the Filipinos to buy American gasoline, tires, and spare parts, while the introduction of the refrigerator, beauty parlor, soft drinks, and many American products, made the Philippines an economic dependency of the United States.

These things have conditioned the Filipinos to think in American terms and ideals, a conditioning whose effects are very much in evidence even today. As a consequence, Filipino taste, mental attitude, way of living, even their defects, are borrowed from the Americans. The writing of Philippine history, alas, is not an exception, for we find in our midst writers of history books whose point of view is that of an American and whose ideal is purely commercial. The tragedy of the Filipinos as a people is that they have the tendency to imitate not the virtues but the vices of their colonizers.

It is for this reason that the rewriting of Philippine history is a difficult task and fraught with danger. The difficulty lies in overcoming the obstacles that centuries of mental slavery have erected across the people's path, while the danger lies in the bristling attitude of obscurantists in our midst who, either because of ignorance or bigotry or both, condemn everything that does not conform with the traditional thinking and outmoded values. Let me illustrate my point by giving myself as an example of a victim of obscurantist rantings. When I pleaded for the re-interpretation of our history under Spain so as to regard it from the Filipino viewpoint and when I did the same, in another lecture, under the Americans, the holy obscurantists immediately called me names and, in one instance, I was labeled a "Marxian"—whatever that means. There is nothing wrong with a Marxian or a Marxist, but the person that heard my statements was blindly, perhaps stupidly, anti-communist and anybody who did not conform with the accepted prejudices was branded a "commie" or a "pink" or a "fellow-traveler", if not a dyed-in-the-wool communist. As a matter of fact, a professional anti-communist who was also a religious leader spent his (?) money in putting out a pamphlet denouncing me, in effect, as a dangerous element in society for having deviated from the beaten path and, especially, for having exposed in less polite terms the deviltry of the Spanish friars during the Spanish regime as one of the causes of the Philippine Revolution. As a consequence, my books were banned from secetarian schools and colleges. (It is, however, a matter of great pride and consolation to me now to know that many sectarian colleges are using some of my books. How attitudes have changed with the time! Thank you.)

The situation today is a little better than that of yesterday. I feel flattered, being human, to be remembered by some people with a good and long memory for having been responsible, in a humble way, for the changing attitude of our students—and even of many teachers of history—in dealing with the past. The past has no voice to make itself heard by the present; it is the historian who, to a large extent, makes the past a living reality. Without the historian the past will forever be consigned to the realm of the dead. The task of the historian and, in particular, the Filipino historian, is not only to delve into the past but to re-live it so that he may, with some measure of accuracy, make the present aware of what had gone.

Let me advert to the writing of our history from our point of view. I shall start by repeating what I have already said countless times, namely, that history is not objective; it is subjective. Since history as a written testament of the past is the work of a human being who has prejudices, passions, emotions, inherited and acquired traits, and individual characteristics unique and inherent in him, it is impossible for him not to be involved in what he is writing. I cannot conceive of a historian who has no emotion, no prejudice, no passion and, therefore, incapable of being involved in what he is doing, and if there is one—which I doubt—he is not a human being but something else not of this earth. At any rate, history as a finished product is man-made and, therefore, subjective. It follows from this proposition that historians differ in their outlook and therefore in their interpretations of facts. This difference is not significant; what is important is that Filipino historians and their readers should acquire the habit of thinking as Filipinos and not as Spaniards or Americans.

This is crucial especially to the people in the underdeveloped countries, for, in the case of the Philippines, if the Filipinos cannot think as Filipinos they cannot expect foreigners to think for them. Since in the past and up to the present our people have been accustomed to the foreign climate of opinion and since our very own leaders—or misleaders—have had enough time to devote themselves only to frivolous activities, our people have acquired the habit of depending on foreigners to think or do things for them. Our history books attest to this. One historical writer, for instance, used the term "spring" to denote the time of the year when a Philippine event happened. Perhaps this writer had been to the Rockies in springtime and upon his return to the Philippines to write a textbook the romance of springtime in the Rockies had exerted such a mesmerizing influence on him as to make him forget that there was and is no such season as spring in the Philippines. Worse, the equivalent of time of spring in the Philippines is summer, a simmering season which causes many people to lose their temper, temporarily or permanently. But this is picayunish compared with the claims of some Filipino historians which are not only not original, but infuriatingly slavish.

One finds, for instance, that Filipinos were allegedly represented in the Spanish Cortes, a claim which, if true, would make the Spanish colonial regime the most dramatic in the world at a time when autocracy and imperialism, with all their ugly connotations, were the fashion. One finds this subject expanded into at least a chapter in most Philippine history textbooks, thereby making Filipino students who read such claims regard the Spanish occupation of the Philippines as heavenly. I do not wish to be a "kill-joy", but it is my opinion—an opinion based on facts and not on fantasies—that the so-called Philippine representation to the Spanish Cortes was actually a misrepresentation, for, in the first place, the election of representatives was prepared and participated in by Spaniards, not by Filipinos; secondly, the elected representatives were not Filipinos but Spaniards; and finally, these elected delegates represented Spanish, not Filipino, interests. It is for these reasons that I have never treated this subject the way it has been treated in other history books. I find the subject inconsequential and irrelevant to the history of the Filipino people. For a Filipino historian to discuss the alleged representation to the Cortes with an alacrity with which an *aficionado* of the bullfight regards his favorite *matador*, is to adopt the Spanish viewpoint of our history.

A Spanish friar's viewpoint regarding the cause of the Ilokos uprising of 1815 has been adopted by some teachers of history and even by historical writers. The cause, according to the friar and adopted by many Filipino writers, was the "revocation of the Cadiz Constitution of 1812." Any intelligent student can see at once that the Ilokanos who rose in arms against the colonial government were illiterate and could not have understood any political constitution, let alone the Spanish Constitution of 1812, which was written in Spanish and not translated into any Philippine languages. Perhaps an inquisitive person might say that the 1815 uprising as discussed by a friar and adopted by Filipino historians is of small moment. Not so. What the alleged cause of the 1815 uprising signifies is that the yokels of the Ilokos hinterland were so highly educated as to understand what the Cadiz Constitution was all about. This, in turn, implies that the Spanish rulers gave the Filipinos a sophisticated kind of education which led them to read and understand the Cadiz Constitution whose suppression in Spain led the Ilokanos to take up arms. If these are facts of our history, the Spanish regime in the Philippines was flawless and, in fact, heavenly. But are they historical facts? To the Spaniards of the *entresuelo,* the friar tale may appear true, but why should the Filipinos follow the Spanish viewpoint in matters that concern their country and people, I am not saying that Filipino historians should twist historical facts to suit their nationalist orientation; what is obvious from the foregoing is that when a set of acts can be interpreted in more ways than one, the Filipino historian should opt for the one which is close to the Filipino soul—without, of course, twisting the facts either by addition and suppression or by lifting sentences or parts thereof out of context.

Let me clarify this point by giving an example. To American historical writers, Aguinaldo and his men who fought in the Filipino-American war were *insurrectos* or bandits. This is natural of an American to say, but for a Filipino to follow the American opinion is not only to be ignorant of the facts of our Revolution and the war with the United States, but also to be slavish. What are the facts? When the war with the United States broke out on the night of 4 February 1899, the

Americans controlled only the Walled City (Intramuros), which was Spanish Manila, Manila Bay, and the Cavite Arsenal. The Filipinos controlled the rest. How then could the Filipinos be insurgents when they controlled 99.99%, more or less, of their country? That the treaty of 10 December 1898 concluded between Spain and the United States transferred the Philippines to the latter is undoubtedly a fact. But Spain had no right to cede the Philippines to the United States because her sovereignty over the Philippines had already been extinguished. Consequently, Spain had no right to give to another what she no longer possessed. The fact of the matter is that the Philippines was an independent republic *de facto* and the armed confrontation forced upon her by the army of the United States in the Philippines was not, by any logic, an insurgency but a full-fledged war between two independent nations. Let the Americans call this armed conflict "Filipino insurgency"—that is their right but let no Filipino at heart parrot them simply because they were the victor in that armed confrontation.

I can multiply historical facts which the great majority of Filipino historical writers have interpreted through foreign eyes. This is, however, a tedious affair which I do not wish to impose on you. I should like, nevertheless, to close this dialogue with a personal note. I have been criticized by certain quarters, mostly by those who have not been liberated from the traditional view of Philippine history, for treating the Spanish period of our history in a "cavalier" manner, which is to say, that I gave only three chapters to the Spanish period which lasted for three centuries. The traditional or Spanish viewpoint of our history, derived mostly from the Spanish Filipinologist Wenceslao E. Retana, discusses with some prolixity everything the Spaniards did in the Philippines—except the graft and corruption in the government and the extracurricular activities of many friars. Filipino historians, retracing Retana's heavy footsteps, discuss with alacrity such irrelevant subjects as Spanish expeditions to the Moluccas, the Marianas, French Indo-China and other places, in which the Filipinos' only role was that of rowers. Other subjects in which the Filipinos did not play any significant part are also discussed with such enthusiasm as to make one wonder what the furor is all about. These and subjects not related to the development of the Filipino nation I dismissed in a few words, thus economizing on time, energy, and paper. A Spaniard once asked me why I treated the Spanish period of Philippine history in such "arbitrary" manner. I answered him, thus: "Spanish historians give the Moors, who ruled Spain for eight centuries, only a few pages; I give the Spaniards, who ruled the Philippines for only three centuries, three full chapters, and here you are complaining."

The rewriting of Philippine history, however, entails a great deal of self-introspection and self-criticism, for it involves not only nationalism on the part of the historian, but also the concept of national development. A nation cannot develop nationally unless it has a definite idea of its past, for the present is rooted in the past and the future in the present. It is thus that the future ultimately has its basis in the past. Unless we go back to the past not for the sake of merely reminiscing it in a romantic way but to trace our roots so that we may be able to single out our mistakes and so avoid them in preparing our future, we cannot take even a step forward. The concept of development, whether national or local, is continuous and continuity is the soul of development. It is in this that I plea with you, especially the teachers among you, to make our students history-conscious and so to awaken in them the spirit of nationalism and the consciousness of national development through sustained and honest efforts at building up the community and the national polity.

The Writing of History*

Pedro A. Gagelonia

I HAVE NO DOUBTS that I should greet all of you today the way I did—as fellow historians. For indeed, you and I are historians, by profession or not. And the situation is best expressed by Carl Becker, a noted historian himself, when he said: "Everyman his own historian."

"Normally," explains Becker, "the memory of every man, when he awakens in the morning, reaches out into the country of the past and of distant places and instantaneously recreates his little world of endeavor, pulls them together as if they were things said and done in his yesterdays, and coordinates them with his present perceptions and with things to be said and done in his tomorrows. Without this historical knowledge, this memory of things said and done, his today would be aimless, and his tomorrow without significance."

Imagine a situation where one awakens one morning unable to remember anything said and done. He would then be a lost soul. But normally, this does not happen. As an individual, we remember everything we say or do. And this we do, and must do, at every waking moment.

That every man is his own historian, is further explained by Louis Gottschalk, an equally noted historian, as he writes:

> Every normal adult knows, has read, and has written enough history. A normal adult has a memory that embraces several years of experience. In the course of that experience, he has read, and heard,

---

* Paper read in the Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at Silliman University, Dumaguete City, on January 22, 1972.

many historical documents, and in all probability, has written many potential historical documents.

> Among these documents may be personal and business letters, speeches, notes in notebooks, or even on scraps of paper, datebook and and diary entries. Any one of these, if it should fall into the hands of a historian interested in him, or the place in which he lived, or his times, or the activities in which he engaged, might become a source of some knowledge no matter how meager and unreliable.

In short, both Becker and Gottschalk believe that every man has a chance not only of writing his own history, but also a great chance to be among those whose records may come to the attention of a writer of history. When this happens, and this very likely occurs several decades after an event has taken place, every man is therefore afforded the chance to win immortality in the pages of history.

But what about those who are historians by profession, you may ask. What have they to do with the ordinary man? And what has the ordinary man to do with the professional historians?

"Each of us," writes Becker, "is Mr. Everyman. Each of us is subject to the limitations of time and place; and for each of us, the pattern of remembered things said and done will be woven at the behest of circumstance and purpose . . . We are Mr. Everyman's historian as well as our own, since our histories serve the double purpose which written histories have always served, that of keeping alive the recollection of memorable men and events."

Come to think of it, indeed, we all are historians.

For this particular occasion, with time allowing only a limited discussion of a subject as broad as the "writing of history," we are constrained to limit ourselves to the most fundamental and basic facts which have to be learned. Conscious as we are of our limitations, and to be saved from serious errors, we shall, as we go along, seek the aid of competent scholars in this field. It would be wise to stay close to the tried and tested mechanics applied by the authorities before us to which their success at history writing may be attributed. We will, for instance, make liberal use of thoughts, ideas, and systems of renowned history writers like Carl Becker, Louis Gottschalk, Will and Ariel Durant, Harry E. Barnes, R. G. Collingwood, and a few others whose names have escaped this writer's memory but whose ideas have remained and have been applied nonetheless.

WHAT IS HISTORY?

Different historians variably define the term *history* in as many different ways. But it is safe to say that regardless of their individual elaboration of its definition, said historians agree on one basic thing, that is, *history is a record of the past.* Despite the manifold allegations of authorities which often make defining impossible in exact terms, history remains a record of past events. Add to this a number of questions and the variability is compounded. Questions like "Do we really know what the past is? What did actually happen? Is history a "fable not quite agreed upon"? Other ideas also exist, such as, "Our knowledge of any past event is always incomplete, probably inaccurate, beclouded by ambivalent evidence and biased historians, and perhaps distorted by our own patriotic or religious partisanship," and even such discouraging pronouncements as "Most history is guessing, and the rest is prejudice."

Nevertheless, following are some of the most readily acceptable definitions of the term *history.* Will and Ariel Durant, for instance, define history in very simple terms. They consider history "in its troublesome duplexity, as the events or record of the past."

Barnes defines the term, in popular usage, as carrying two very different meanings. "It is often used," he says, "to designate the sum total of human activities in the past. A more common usage is that which looks upon history as the *record of the events* rather than *events themselves.*"

In the rather objective sense, history is, according to Prof. James Harvey Robinson, "all we know about everything man has ever done, or thought, or hoped, or felt." In short, subjectively or psychologically expressed, history "may be regarded as a record of all that has occurred within the realm of human consciousness."

Gottschalk explains the English word *history* as derived from the Greek *nou* which means *learning*.

> As used by the Greek philosopher Aristotle, history meant a systematic account of a set of natural phenomena, whether or not chronological ordering was a factor in the account; and that usage, though rare, still prevails in English in the phrase *natural history*. In the course of time, however, the equivalent Latin word *scientia* (English, science) came to be used more regularly to designate non-chronological systematic accounts of natural phenomena; and the word *history* was reserved usually for accounts of phenomena (especially human affairs) in chronological order.

From Gottschalk's explanation of history, it may be gathered that he is more inclined to accept it as simply "the past of mankind." He qualifies his idea of history, though, as he says:

> It requires only a moment's reflection to recognize that in a sense history cannot be reconstructed. The past of mankind for the most part is beyond recall. Even those who are blessed with the best memories cannot re-create their own past, since in the life of all men there must be events, persons, words, thoughts, places, and fancies that made no impression at all at the time they occurred, or have since been forgotten.

For instance, a *fortiori*, or the experience of a generation that has long been dead, about which no record has been left, or whose records, if they exist, "have never been disturbed by the historian's touch, is beyond the possibility of total recollection." Therefore, the complete reconstruction of the total past of mankind, although it is the goal of historians, becomes a goal which they know fully well is unattainable.

In successive ages, within living memory, the duty to keep alive the recollections of men and events has been entrusted to bards, story-tellers, minstrels, soothsayers, and priests. To them had been entrusted the duty to keep "useful myths." Offhand, however, let us not be misled by the "usefulness" of these myths.

History of history itself has revealed that a myth which was once valid may eventually be discarded version of the human story, and may, in due course be relegated to the category of discarded myths. The present crop of historians, by profession or not, have something in common with our predecessors. It had been their duty, as it should be ours,

> not to create, but to preserve and perpetuate the social tradition; to harmonize, as well as ignorance and prejudice permit, the actual and the remembered series of events; to enlarge and enrich the specious present common to all, to the end that all mankind may judge of what it is doing, in the light of what it has done, and what it hopes to do.

"History as an extension of the social memory," says Becker, "is an art of long standing."

> History in this sense is story, in aim always a true story; a story that employs all the devices of literary art to present the succession of events thus presented, to derive a satisfactory meaning. The history written by historians, like the history informally fashioned by Mr. Everyman, is thus a convenient blend of truth and fancy, of what we distinguished as 'fact' and 'interpretation'.
>
> In primitive times, when tradition is orally transmitted, bards and and story-tellers frankly embroider and improvise the facts to heighten the dramatic import of the story. With the use of written records, history, gradually differentiated from fiction, is understood as the story of events that actually happened; and with the increase and refinement of knowledge, the historian recognizes that his FIRST DUTY IS TO BE SURE OF HIS FACTS, let their meaning be what it may.

HISTORICAL FACTS AND HISTORICAL METHODS

A *historical fact* may be defined as an item of information derived directly or indirectly from historical documents and regarded as credible after careful testing in accordance with the standard tests of historical methods.

In *historiography* (the writing of history), *historical method* is the process of critically examining and analyzing the records and survivals of the past.

In the analysis of a particular historical information, the historian undertakes a big responsibility. As earlier mentioned, the complete reconstruction of the past from the data available is a goal which is unattainable. It is unfortunate that most of the past have no further evidence of the human setting in which to place surviving artifacts; we do not even have the artifacts.

Lamenting the incompleteness of historical records and limited historical knowledge, Gottschalk writes:

> Most human affairs happen without leaving vestiges or records of any kind behind them. The past, having happened, perished forever with only occasional traces . . . Besides, only a small part of what

happened in the past was ever observed; only a part of what was observed in the past was remembered by those who observed it; only a part of what was remembered was recorded; only a part of what was recorded has survived; only a part of what has survived has come to the historians' attention; only a part of what has come to their attention is credible; only a part of what is credible has been grasped; and only a part of what has been grasped can be expounded or narrated by the historian.

In short, the whole history of the past can be known to the historian only through the surviving record of history-as-record, and most of history-as-record is only the surviving part of the recorded part of the remembered part of the observed part of the whole. It may be noted from Gottschaik's explanation that "before the past is set forth by the historian, it is likely to have gone through eight separate steps at each of which some of it has been lost. And there is no guarantee that what remains is the most important, the largest, the most valuable, the most representative, or the most enduring part. Apparently, the object that the historian studies is not only incomplete; it is markedly variable as records are lost or rediscovered.

To a historian, any item of information obtained is the subject to scrutiny. Is it credible? Unfortunately for the historian, he is not allowed or permitted to imagine things that could not reasonably have happened. But he is frequently required to imagine things that must have happened. Even in this limited effort, however, the historian finds himself greatly handicapped. He can rarely tell the story even of a part of the past "as it actually occurred." In addition to the incompleteness of record, the historian is faced with the inadequacy of the human imagination and of human speech for such an actual re-creation. But he can always try to "approach the actual past as a limit." In every angle of the historian's efforts, he must be sure that his records really come from the past, and that his imagination is directed *"toward re-creation and not creation."*

HISTORIAN'S RESPONSIBILITY

On the premise that "every man is his own historian," one realizes the enormous task involved in any attempt to write history. It is likewise clear to see how much its preparation depends on one's memory. The greater portion of the endeavor apparently depends on the ability of the historian to analyze and to examine data, and to remain awake and cognizant of the incidents in the past. No doubt much depends on memories, written and unwritten. It becomes imperative that the individual who attempts to write history, and who chooses to assume the task, is adequately prepared and forewarned well enough.

It helps immensely to bear in mind that a historian's motto may well be "the past for the sake of the past." Contemporary writers of history, like those of the past, assume a dual personality: *first*, as guardian of cultural heritage, and *second*, as narrator of the development of mankind.

"As guardian of cultural heritage," explains Gottschalk, "the writer concerns himself with the establishment of accurate, detailed and impartial accounts of past persons, events, thoughts, institutions, and things, as far as his knowledge and critiques of sources will permit. As a narrator of the development of mankind, he necessarily enmeshes himself in sociology, philosophy, and even in considerations of a personal nature regarding the selection and emphasis of material."

For his part, Becker says

> that historians write history from the human rather than the cosmic point of view. This is so because however different the doings of man may be to the cosmic force of which they are the result, they are vastly interesting to us; and vastly important, measured by the standard of human desires, purposes and aspirations.
>
> If the historian is to write history at all, he must be interested in the activity of man in the past, not primarily as something to be in itself intellectually apprehended, but rather as something to be practically appraised in the light of ends that are to be desirable and attainable in the future.

Becker cites Mr. Wells, noted author of a book entitled *Outline of History*, as having written history "in order to estimate the quality and amount and range of the hopes with which humanity faces its destiny." Mr. Well writes his history in the light of a "definitely conceived theory of human progress." To him the indispensable factor in progress is intelligence—the expanding capacity of the human mind.

It is of the utmost importance that the historian maintains exactness of meaning in the writing of history, for he is constantly attempting to convey the truth by the inadequate means of verbal expression. He is expected "not only to create moods and to depict an atmosphere, but also to present a complete and accurate account."

Among others, the historian has the obligation to use words in their exact significance or meaning, to define his terms, to avoid synonyms that are only approximate rather than identical to what he means. He is likewise under special obligation to avoid vague generalities and typifications as much as possible.

Needless to say, before a historian gets to write history, he ought to plan his article or chapter so as to have some idea what its beginning, middle, and end will be. He must also bear in mind all throughout that "the prime objective in historical narrative or exposition is the historian's effective and correct re-interpretation of what the documents teach."

SOURCES

The historian avails himself of materials, other than the printed books, that may have "some bearing upon the persons in that area at that time functioning in that fashion." These materials are known as *sources*.

Written and oral sources may either be *primary* or *secondary*. A *primary source* is the testimony of an eyewitness, or of a witness by any other of the senses, or of a mechanical device like the dictaphone—that is, of one who or that which was present at the events of which he or it tells, sometimes simply called *eyewitness*. It must thus have been produced by a contemporary of the events it narrates. It does not, however, need to be original in the strict and legal sense of the word original. A document may be considered original, and of great importance to the historian if: (1) it contains fresh and creative ideas; (2) it is not translated from the language in which it was first written; (3) it is in its earliest unpolished stage; (4) its text is the approved text, unmodified and untampered with; and (5) it is the earliest available source of the information it provides.

A *secondary source*, on the other hand, is the testimony of anyone who is *not* an eyewitness—that is, of one who was not present at the events of which he tells.

Very often the historian has to depend upon secondary works principally for a knowledge of the background into which to fit the contemporary documents. Secondary works include the second-hand narrative of other historians. As a general rule, however, the historian needs to be cautious, and suspicious about secondary works. If ever he should avail himself of said works, the historian should do so only for any one of the following reasons:

(1) to derive the setting into which to fit the contemporary evidence upon his problem (as earlier mentioned), but being always prepared to doubt and to rectify the secondary account wherever a critical analysis of a contemporary witness makes it necessary to do so;

(2) to get leads to other bibliographical data;

(3) to acquire quotations or citations from contemporary or other sources, but only if they are not more fully available elsewhere, and always with skepticism about their accuracy, especially if they are translated from another tongue; and

(4) to derive interpretations of hypotheses regarding his problem, but only with a view to testing or improving upon them, never with the intention of accepting them outright.

Generally, the historian is more concerned with the particular data within the source than with the source as a whole. The possibility is not very remote that an essentially primary source may contain what may be considered secondary data (and therefore less usable); and that a book that is essentially secondary may contain personal letters or the like which may well be considered first-hand evidence if they are genuine and relevant.

As a whole, sources used, whether primary or secondary, are very important to the historian because they contain primary particulars, or at least suggest leads to primary particulars. These particulars "are trustworthy NOT BECAUSE of the book or article or report they are in, BUT BECAUSE of the reliability of the narrator as a witness of those particulars."

It may be observed that the historian also frequently uses the term *document* (from the word *docere* meaning *to teach*), and does so in several senses. It is sometimes used to mean "a written source of historical information, as contrasted with oral testimony or with artifacts, pictorial survivals, and archaeological remains."

Document may also be the term "reserved for only official and state papers, such as treaties, laws, grants, deeds, etc."

In historiography (the writing of history), the word *document* as contained in the term *documentation* is understood to mean "any process of proof based upon any kind of source, whether written, oral, pictorial or archeological." In this particular sense, it becomes "synonymous with *source*, written or not, official or not, primary or not."

WRITTEN DOCUMENTS

The historian deals chiefly with testimony contained in written documents. Gottschalk classifies the most commonly used, and the most readily available, written documents in the order of their reliability as follows: (1) Contemporary Records; (2) Confidential Reports; (3) Public Reports; (4) Written Questionnaires; (5) Government Documents and Compilations; (6) Expressions of Opinion; (7) Fiction, Song, and Poetry; and (8) Folklore, Place Names, and Proverbs.

1. A *contemporary record* may be defined as a document intended to convey instructions regarding a transaction, or to aid the memory of the persons immediately involved in a transaction. It is distinguished from a *report* in: (a) *time-lapse*, (b) *purpose*, and (c) the *confidential nature* of its contents. Included here are *instruction or command, stenographic and phonographic records, business and legal papers, and personal notebooks and private memoranda.*

2. *Confidential reports* differ from records in that they are usually written after the event, are often intended to create an impression rather than merely to aid memory, and are less intimate, even though not intended for large audiences. Hence, they are less reliable, as a general rule, than *contemporary records*.

Among the most reliable of reports, since they are frequently written by experts, for confidential purposes, and shortly after the events are narrated, are *military and diplomatic* *dispatches.* Also included is the *journal* or *diary* if written spontaneously and intimately. Very often, however, a diary or a journal contains entries under a certain date that were not made until that date had long passed, and thus is more accurately classified as a *memoir.* There is also the possibility and danger that a diary when published (the usual form in which the historian sees it) has been "touched up" or "doctored" for political or personal reasons, and the degree of modification hidden until the original manuscript can be examined by a later historian. For instance, in general, diaries concerned with recent political crises in totalitarian countries are subject to suspicion, because very likely passages have to be omitted, and names and events disguised in order to shield the individuals involved or to avoid libel suits.

Another document in the nature of a confidential report are *personal letters* which rank high in credibility also if spontaneous and intimate. They are not, however, very likely to contain the testimony of a skilled observer. Frequently they are intended to exert influence or to create an impression, are often not private and confidential but are intended for all the members of a family and a circle of friends, and often deal with hearsay and remote matters. They are generally inferior to some other kinds of documents as testimony.

Personal letters also frequently contain expressions of politeness and esteem that may deceive the reader who is not familiar with the customs of the letter-writer's region. Personal considerations may also color the presentation of facts and not contain truths, like a lover's letter to his beloved, even though the letters might be entirely confidential.

3. *Public reports* are to be distinguished from *confidential reports* chiefly by the *number of persons expected* (*or desired*) *by their authors to read them.* Since that number is larger, the general degree of reliability is less than for *confidential reports.*

Newspaper reports and dispatches, for instance, by the reporter for the world at large, are probably the most reliable of the three public reports (*memoirs and autobiographies and official* or *authorized histories* being the two others), because the time-lapse between event and recording is usually short. There is, however, the big risk that this virtue may be "sacrificed" because of haste and therefore carelessness of verification.

The reliability of a newspaper dispatch may frequently be judged by the reputation of the journal in which it appears or of the press with which it originates. Nevertheless, each dispatch should undergo wherever possible, the tests for its own credibility. It goes without saying that a reliable dispatch may sometimes appear in a journal of generally good reputation.

The historian must also be on guard against the tendency of newspapers to give interdependent accounts for events. Until the 19th century, the special correspondent was relatively unknown and newspapers frankly copied from each other; now they depend more upon the same syndicated report. Hence, it is seldom safe to assume, unless the reporters' names are given, that because an event is described in two newspapers, the descriptions are by two independent witnesses. Even then, one cannot be sure that two (or more) reporters did not collaborate.

The evaluation of newspaper reports has also been made complicated by the practice of publishers to give prominent display to news favorable to the owner's policies and "killing", or misleadingly headlining, or re-writing news that may be unfavorable.

Memoirs and autobiographies have the nature of public reports. The historian is very lucky if he is able to make a personal examination of a living memoir-writer, for they can then have personal corroboration of the authenticity and the meaning of the document. Also, the gaps of testimony can be pieced in, judgment of the author's competence becomes easier, and his inconsistencies and his contradictions of others can perhaps be harmonized or eliminated.

In contrast, the historian usually deals with autobiographies of subjects long dead or beyond personal contact. It is impossible to ask them whether certain parts of their narrative are based on their own experience or the experience of others;

whether they are absolutely certain of the details they give which contradict other evidences, and why they are certain; whether their motives are to tell the unvarnished truth, or to plead a special case. It is impossible to clarify implications that are obscure and to supply missing links in their narratives.

In here may likewise arise the problem of "ghost-writing." Also, perversions for journalistic purposes, suppressions to avoid bad taste, libel, or the revelation of confidential information, and elaborations for dramatic effect, creep in to heighten unreliability. The practice of having memoirs written in collaboration with known writers make difficult to determine what is first-hand recollection by the alleged author and what is secondary history by the collaborator.

The third of the public reports are the *official or authorized histories,* which are written under excellent circumstances permitting the exploitation of official records and personages for their testimony. As a class, however, they have one marked weakness, a weakness derived from an understandable effort to appeal to constituencies by making them journalistic and "timely" or "topical."

As a general rule, *official histories* must be treated with caution. Not only are they liable to reveal the weaknesses inherent in investigations of subjects of current interest; they are also often largely secondary in nature since they are based upon information only partly obtained by the author at first hand, if indeed they are not wholly dependent upon the analysis of others' testimony. And if at all primary, there is a tendency to suppress embarrassing, incriminating, and confidential information, and to present apologia.

4. *Written questionnaires* are highly reliable if they are intended to elicit present opinion only, particularly if the questions are precise, the answers properly weighted, and the confidential relationships between the questioner and the questioned are assured. Where it is intended to extract information about the experience of the person questioned, however, it is likely to be somewhat unreliable. In certain instances, though, such questionnaires may undoubtedly reveal much information not otherwise available.

5. *Government documents and compilations* generally

command the respectful attitude of many historians. It should not be forgotten, though, that many government documents are not even primary sources, but are compilations from reports of many compilers, perhaps several steps removed from the actual observation. Yet when they are reports of *the proceedings of governmental bodies or laws and regulations* they may very properly be considered first-hand.

Government compilations are apt to differ from records in that the farther the publication is from the origin of the things compiled, the more reliable they are likely to be. The lapse of time may permit corrections of earlier compilations, greater care in making the compilation, and improvement of methods of acquiring the pertinent data, and probably also diminishes the political pressures upon the compilers.

Proceedings of governmental bodies which are truly *stenographic records* are subject to doubt regarding their reliability as records because of three principal reasons: (1) sometimes the proceedings are made up long after the event; (2) even when the proceedings appear more or less contemporaneously, they may contain "insertions." A glaring example of this is the Congressional Record in which members of Congress may insert speeches that were never actually delivered; and, 3) most often the proceedings, though otherwise reliable, have been polished at least for style and precision if not for contents. To the historian who is interested in the mental life of the participants, such manipulation of proceedings is a deprivation.

When *government documents* are compiled, polished, or supplemented, they may be original in the sense that they are the earliest available without necessarily being primary sources.

On the other hand, *laws and regulations* may seem to be totally impersonal documents at first glance, but a moment's thought reveals that they are the expression of the hopes, fears, commands, threats, or expectations of some individual or group of individuals. It is true, however, that official compilations of *laws and regulations* are primary evidence of their own content, and the feelings and motives behind them are only inferential.

6. *Expressions of opinion* as source of information are valuable to the historian, only for the opinion expressed therein. Included in here are *editorials, essays, speeches, pamphlets, letters to the editor, public opinion polls,* and the like. Whether individual or public, the opinion expressed in these documents may or may not be reliable, depending upon the competence of their authors as witnesses. Although they are merely expressions of opinion, when the question regarding their sincerity arises, it must be corroborated by other evidence. As a whole, however, these documents are the best sources of expressed opinions.

Extra care must be taken in the evaluation of *expressions of opinion* because of the temptation to believe that agreement among many opinions establishes as fact the point agreed upon. At its best, even the most systematic *public opinion poll* may establish only the degree of consensus on the question polled, and not the correctness of the opinions given or of the factual data implied in the consensus.

7. *Fiction, song* and *poetry* as documents reveal to the historian the author's likes, dislikes, hopes and fears, and provide the historian with an understanding of some of the local color, the environment, that helped to shape the author's views.

Historians particularly interested in the social behaviour, attitudes, and cultural patterns of a certain era avail themselves of the fiction, song, and poetry of the period for information contained in these documents by some other knowledge.

8. *Folklore, place names,* and *proverbs* often tell much about the aspirations, superstitions, and customs of the peoples among whom the stories developed. The historian should, however, be able to distinguish between the legendary embroideries and their authentic foundations, as in the case of *folklores. Place names,* on the other hand, may help locate certain spots and may help illustrate the extent or spread of certain settlers in particular areas. But even with this, there is a possibility that said names are recently acquired. In case of *proverbs,* they may reveal indigenous practices rather than the borrowed ones. Unfortunately for the historian, not much of these documents, particularly of the remote times, are available even as reference.

Generally, *folklore, place names,* and *proverbs,* just like *fiction, song,* and *poetry,* need some kind of a historian who should know about to what extent the documents reflect the cultural atmosphere of their time.

TESTS OF CREDIBILITY

To the historian, says Gottschalk, any single testimony or any single detail of a testimony is credible, provided it passes four tests, all four tests, of credibility, namely:

1. Was the ultimate source of the detail (the primary witness) able to tell the truth? The ability to tell the truth rests in part upon the witness's nearness to the event. *Nearness* is here used in both a geographical and a chronological sense. The reliability of the witness's testimony tends to vary in proportion to his *own remoteness from the scene in time and space,* and the *remoteness from the event in time and space of his recording it.*

There are three steps in historical testimony, namely: (1) observation; (2) recollection; and (3) recording. At each of these steps something of the possible testimony may be lost. Geographical as well as chronological closeness to the event affects all three steps and helps to determine both *how much will be lost* and the *accuracy of what is retained.*

Competence of the witness also affects his ability to tell the truth. Competence depends largely upon the witness's degree of expertness, state of mental and physical health, age, education, memory, narrative skill, etc. The ability to estimate numbers is especially subject to suspicion.

The *degree of attention* of the witness is also an important factor in his ability to tell the truth. The entire meaning of an event may, and can, rest upon an unnoticed act which has taken place. The common human inability to see things clearly and whole makes even the best of witnesses suspect.

Leading questions, or those questions which are asked by implying the expected answer make it hard to tell the whole truth. Questions that have to be answered by a "yes" or a "no" are liable to be misleading. In this respect, misinformation is likely to be derived from the witness whose testimony is circumscribed by the questioner.

Reasoning in circle, is another factor considered by Gottschalk as affecting a witness's ability to tell the truth. For instance, one reason why religious problems and events received so much attention in the history of the Middle Ages is because the principal sources were written by clergymen. If some other groups, like architects, landowners, soldiers, or even merchants, have written more of these sources, perhaps the questions asked and the answers given could provide a different picture of the medieval life.

This kind of circular argument must be guarded against when an effort is being made to ascribe unsigned writings to a supposed author, for it is easy to assume that the ideas of the writings are characteristic of the supposed author if those articles are the basis of the assumptions regarding the author's characteristics.

Another almost inescapable shortcoming which affects the ability of the witness to tell the truth is *egocentrism.* Even the most modest observer will tell *what he himself heard* and *what he himself did* as if those details were the most important things that were said and done. Often it is impossible for him to tell his story in any other terms, since that is the only way he knows it.

As a whole, *inability to tell the truth* leads to errors of omission, rather than commission, because of lack of completeness or lack of balance in observation, recollection, or narrative. These errors may give a picture that is out of perspective, as to miss or fail to include some important things and to over-emphasize what it includes.

2. The second acid test of credibility is embodied in the question: Was the primary witness willing to tell the truth? The historian inevitably has to deal with documents whose authors, although competent to tell the truth, consciously or unconsciously tell lies or falsehoods.

A number of conditions tend especially toward untruthfulness on the part of the *witness, as in the case* of the *interested witness.* The interested witness or a cause dear to him directly benefits from the perversion of truth, as in the case of *propaganda* which is perhaps the worst example of this kind of testimony.

Another instance which gives rise to doubt about the witness's willingness to tell the truth is when he is *biased,* bias for and bias against, a particular situation. It becomes important to the historian to know what the witness's frame of reference may be, as well as his religious, political, social, economic, racial, national, regional, local, family, personal, and other ties. Any of these facts may dictate a predilection or a prejudice that will shade his testimony.

The truthfulness of a statement is also affected by the witness's desire to *please* or to *displease* which may lead to the coloring or avoidance of truth. The motive here is usually personal and individual.

In certain instances, too, the truthfulness of a testimony is affected by the witness's *literary style* which sometimes dictates the sacrifice of truth. Authors of autobiographies and letters, especially when they write for private amusement, may be tempted to state as fact what is only hearsay or tradition or even fiction. Frequently too narrators and reporters seek to appear as knowing everything.

Laws and conventions sometimes also oblige witnesses to depart from strict truthfulness. The laws of libel and of good taste have often precluded complete accuracy in some works of history. Etiquette in letters and conversation, conventions and formalities in treaties and public documents require politeness and expressions of esteem that can obviously be false or empty.

Closely related to the factor of laws and conventions are the many instances of *inexact dating* of historical documents because of conventions and formalities involved. Some medieval rulers used to date documents as of certain towns though they were not at those towns on the dates indicated.

Expectation or anticipation frequently leads a witness astray. Certain witnesses lack precision in their testimony because their eyes and ears are closed to fair observation, and are blinded by prejudices. For instance, those who know revolutionaries to be blood-thirsty, and the conservatives to be gentlemanly, will rarely be expected to give out the opposite idea about them.

As a rule, unwillingness of a witness to tell the truth, whether intentional or not, leads to misstatement of facts and therefore misinformation. The situation where the witness is unwilling to tell the truth leads to misstatement of facts more often than when facts are omitted. When the witness is unable and unwilling to tell the truth, the result is a document that commits errors both of omission and commission. The historian must always bear in mind, however, that even the worst witness may occasionally tell the truth. It is then the historian's business to extract every bit of relevant truth if he can.

3. Third question to be asked for purposes of satisfying the credibility of a document is: Is the primary witness accurately reported with regard to the detail under examination?

The historian always uses *primary* (that is, eyewitness) testimony whenever he can. When he can find NO primary witness, however, he uses the BEST secondary witness available. In cases where he uses secondary witnesses, the historian needs to have satisfactory answers to the following questions:

(a) On whose primary testimony does the secondary witness base his statements?

(b) Did the secondary witness accurately report the primary testimony as a whole?

(c) If not, in what details did he accurately report the primary testimony?

Satisfactory answers to the second and third questions may provide the historian with the whole or the gist of the primary testimony upon which the secondary witness may be his only means of knowledge. In such cases, the secondary source is the historian's "original" source, in the sense of being the *origin* of his knowledge. In so far as this "original" source is an *accurate report* of primary testimony, the historian tests its credibility as he would that of the primary testimony itself.

While a law court would readily discard hearsay evidence, on the simple ground that it is mere hearsay, the historian would not do so hastily. Instead, the historian accepts a hearsay evidence as long as it can be established as accurate reporting of primary testimony.

4. The last of the four tests which any detail in a testimony must pass in order to be considered *credible historical document* is: Is there any independent corroboration of the detail under examination?

An item in a document or a primary particular that has been extracted from a document cannot as yet be regarded as historical fact although there is a strong presumption that it is trustworthy. The general rule among historians is to accept as historical only those particulars which rest upon the independent testimony of two or more reliable witnesses. *Independence* is of great importance to the validity of a corroboration, although this is not always easy to determine.

Where any two witnesses agree, they may be doing so because they are testifying independently to an observed fact. But it is also possible that they agree only because one has copied from the other, or because one has been unduly influenced by the other, or because both have copied from, or been unduly influenced by, a third source. Unless the independence of the observers is established, agreement in their testimony may be a confirmation of a lie or of a mistake rather than corroboration of a fact.

Many historians will note that frequently, however, particularly in the remote phases of history, even the most diligent research fails to yield two independent documents testifying to the same facts. It follows, then, that for particulars known or knowable only by a single witness, the historian is obliged to break the general rule which requires two independent and reliable witnesses for corroboration. Other kinds of corroboration must be sought then.

For one, the *absence of contradiction or the very silence* of other contemporary sources upon a matter which appears to be common knowledge may sometimes mean confirmation of the information. In another case, the *general credibility* of a document may serve as corroboration. The reputation of the author for veracity, the lack of self-contradiction within the document, the absence of contradiction by other sources, freedom from anachronisms or statements which are out of proper historical time, and the way the author's testimony fits into the otherwise known facts help to determine the general credibility of a document.

Another decisive test of evidence, whether given by one or more witness, is *conformity* or *agreement* with other known historical or scientific facts. In the case of a single witness's testimony, the historian usually insists that such condition should be so designated, or properly labeled as the testimony of only one.

FOOTNOTES, USE AND ABUSE

A *footnote,* as the name implies, is a note of comment or reference at the bottom of a page. It serves to add confirmatory evidence to a statement in the text in a particular page, and serves likewise to bolster the writer's argument.

"The historian," says Gottschalk, "who dispenses with the footnote in a serious work dispenses with one of the means whereby others may test his conclusions. Footnotes enable the intelligent reader to know *how* the writer knows."

With the help of the footnote a discriminating writer is assured of greater accuracy. But the most justifiable reason for using a footnote to a narrative or expository text is *to indicate the source of a statement that is challengeable.* The footnote in a page takes the place of the summons to a witness in a court of law.

The footnote is preferably as brief as possible, although at times, where witnesses disagree, it becomes necessary to include both the disagreement and even the resolution of the differences in the footnote. When this occurs, the footnote becomes fairly long, but still remains exclusively for the purpose of documentation, indicating the source of the testimony upon which the footnoted statement or statements rest.

The practice of supplying footnotes fulfill the useful purpose of allowing the specialist or the interested reader to verify the challengeable statement or the quoted word for himself and of providing the future investigators of related subjects with bibliographical leads. For a reader who is not interested in challenge and in verification or further investigation it is not necessary to pay attention to the footnotes.

It is unfortunate that there is a popular dislike for footnotes, especially those that reveal the author's slovenliness. These are the patent insertions that result from new information that has come to the author's attention after completion of the manuscript. Time pressure often no longer permits the incorporation of such late information into the text.

The practice of placing date of doubtful relevance in the footnote, in order to avoid strict judgments on said data, also accounts for the general public annoyance and prejudice against footnotes. This practice gives an air of pedantry to one's work, and is certainly a weak way of solving the problem of relevance. Usually, if the data are relevant, they belong more properly in the text. And if they are irrelevant, they should be omitted entirely. Footnotes that result from the author's lack of literary skill are more pardonable than those that result from sheer pedantry.

Footnotes that contain much more than what are intended only for the specialists (for historians have rarely learned to write footnotes chiefly for the specialist), cannot be disregarded entirely by the general reader. This is because such footnotes, in the mind of the reader, may contain something important to the understanding of the text. As the general reader is forced by the presence of these pedantic footnotes to devote time to reading them, the normal reaction to the footnotes is that of annoyance and prejudice. It is generally believed that in many instances, the popularity of a book is adversely affected by the presence of footnotes, and a few things will so thoroughly interfere with book sales as footnotes.

PROBLEM OF AUTHENTICITY

Where the documents involved in the historian's task are authentic, there is a great feeling of relief for the writer. But the problem of authenticity of historical documents also often arises. And the situation occurs more often for manuscript sources, and less for printed sources. This is because usually some skilled editor has already performed the task of authenticating the printed sources.

To distinguish a hoax or a misrepresentation from a genuine document, the historian has to use tests that are common also in police and legal detection. He examines the materials to see whether they are not anachronistic (or not out of their proper historical time) making the best guess he can of the date of the document. Gottschalk gives the following examples: paper was rare in Europe before the 15th century, and printing was unknown; pencils did not exist there before the 16th century; typewriting was not invented until the 19th century; and India paper came only at the end of that century. With the knowledge of certain historical events, the historian is aided in the determination of anachronisms. Hence the historian is given an idea as to the genuineness of the document.

The historian also tests the genuineness of a manuscript or document by making his best guess of the possible *author* of the document. He sees if he can identify the *handwriting, signature, seal, letterhead,* or *watermark.* Even when the handwriting is unfamiliar, it can be compared with authenticated specimens, although one of the unfulfilled needs of the historian is *isographies* or dictionaries of biography giving examples of handwriting.

For some periods of history, experts use techniques known as *paleography* and *diplomatics,* and are able to know that in certain regions at certain times *handwriting* and the *style* and *form* of official documents were more or less conventionalized. Seals have also been the subject of special study by *sigillographers,* and experts can detect faked ones.

It also often occurs that a forgery is revealed by spelling, particularly of proper names and signatures. *Anachronistic style* (idioms, orthography, or punctuation) can be detected by specialists who are familiar with contemporary writing. Anachronistic reference to events, (that is, too early or too late or too remote), or the dating of a document at a time when the alleged writer could not possibly have been there at the place designated, also reveals fraud.

Sometimes the skillful forger is given away by his too careful following of the best historical sources and his product therefore becomes too *obviously a copy* in certain passages. Or if he avoid detection in this manner, he is given away by the absence of *trivia and otherwise unknown details* from his manufactured account.

Generally, however, if the document or manuscript is found in a family's archives, or among a business firm's or lawyer's papers, or in governmental bureau's records, *its provenance* or *its custody* creates a presumption of its genuineness.

Forgeries of documents, in whole or in part, are common enough "to keep the careful historian constantly on his guard." "Historical documents," writes Gottschalk, "are fabricated for several reasons. Sometimes they are used to bolster a false claim or title . . . At times they are counterfeited for sale . . . At times, fabrication is due to less mercenary considerations as in the case of political propaganda . . . Sometimes quite genuine documents are intended to mislead certain contemporaries and hence have even misled subsequent historians."

STYLE

As in any of the other fields of endeavor, the organization of the materials gathered in preparation for the final printing of a histórical narrative or exposition is left to the historian's individual taste. It very rarely happens, though, that the historian himself pursues the completion of the organization of the materials to its end. Very often, after the painstaking historian has set down carefully the story he has extracted from the sources, he employs an editor or a collaborator with a literary flair to "re-write" it. Where the two "authors" are well teamed, such an arrangement may sometimes be desirable and even ideal. The danger lies, however, in the possibility that the "re-write" man may prefer popular writing to good history. As a whole, the problem of style can be solved by cooperative effort.

"The serious writer," explains Gottschalk, "sometimes finds himself faced with the obligation to choose between accurate history and popularity. For the scholar in such a dilemma, the choice is easy: 'distorting history is a greater offense than torpid (dull) writing! . . .

If a writer's object is to sell books or articles rather than to improve the knowledge and interpretation of history, he should choose a subject so popular to begin with, that nearly all the necessary research has already been done by experts, and all that remains to be done is to present it for popular approval. Such popularization can well be left to competent hacks with a literary flair. That, however, does not excuse the scholarly historian either from cultivating a lively style or from responsibility for the popularization of his subject. If history is to remain the living past, serious historical scholarship must not be still-born.

Objectivity and Impartiality in History*

Teodoro A. Agoncillo

I CHOSE THE TOPIC "Objectivity and Impartiality in History" because objectivity has become a myth not only in the newspaper circles and in the common run of conversation, but also in the academe. In the University of the Philippines, I have been accused of not being objective, that I am a subjective historian and, therefore, not a historian, and so on and so forth. I think it is time for a reconsideration of this idea of objectivity.

What is objectivity?

In common usage, it is an attitude which sees or considers things, events, places and persons without any reference, directly or indirectly, to the person of the writer. The term is synonymous with detachment, which means that the author should not be involved in what he is writing about. This idea has been disseminated far and wide. But in the Philippines, it is rather frustrating to hear almost every day the advice that a reporter or a historian, for instance, should be objective.

This cult of objectivity has its origin in Europe in the 19th century when a school of thought known as the positivist school was founded by the French philosopher, August Comte. According to the positivist, the facts of history should be dealt with in a so-called scientific way, hence the term scientific history. This theory assumes that history is a science and that its method is very much like that of science. The foremost exponent of the positivist view of history was Prof. J. B. Bury of Cambridge University who once said, with finality, "History is a science, no more and no less." To him the facts and methods of history are like those of geology or astronomy. This positivist position was challenged by the relativists in the early part of the present century. According to the relativist, Carl Becker, the great American historian and the most eloquent exponent of relativism in history: "The form and significance of remembered events . . . will vary with the time and place of the observer." In the words of another relativist, the equally great American historian, Charles A. Beard, "Any written history inevitably reflects the thought of the author in his time and cultural setting."

---

* Paper read in the Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at Silliman University, Dumaguete City, on January 22, 1972.

In the Philippines, there is still a preponderance of opinion, educated and uneducated, that objectivity should be the historian's supreme ideal, and, consequently, he should exert all his best effort towards attaining that ideal. The ideal is not debatable. But like all other ideals, it has no basis in actuality. The ideal of objectivity presupposes (a) that the historian is like a computer machine without any emotion, without any passion, and without any prejudices; and (b) that the historian can, owing to his lack of emotion and prejudices, detach himself from his being and like a ghost (I haven't seen one) hover above his subject and look upon it with Olympian detachment, without showing any sign of emotion or bias. This idea, which has dominated the Philippine scene since literacy dawned upon this benighted Republic, had been pounded into the heads of students with the result that today one seldom, if ever. hears a man or woman challenging the positivist school of historical thought. The question is, "Is history objective?"

On the basis of the previous definition of the term, history is not objective, inspite of the claims of some philosophers of history who are decidedly philosophers but not historians, who believe that the discipline, meaning history, is and can be objective. Consider the nature of man:

1. He has emotions and passions;
2. He has thoughts of his own, although some people are rumored to be devoid of any thought at all;
3. He is saddled by hereditary characteristics in whose formation he had no say at all;
4. He is conditioned by his environment and as such, he looks at things through the natural color of his eye glasses, so to speak.

Consequently, man cannot get rid of his prejudices, his sympathies, his feelings, his passions and emotions, and so he sees things from the position he occupies. Let me give you an example. If I ask you to draw my likeness as I stand before you, I am certain that each drawing will be different from the others. In other words, you will draw my likeness in accordance with the position you occupy in this room. Again, if we present two or more historians with the same set of facts and ask them to write an account and interpretation of those facts, the historians will differ not only in their narration of the events based on the set of facts given to them, but also in their interpretation. To prove the validity of these statements all you have to do is read the general history of the Philippines written by different authors.

Perhaps it would be for the benefit of the professors, students and laymen alike to refrain from demanding objectivity from others when they themselves cannot be objective. Whether the historian likes it or not. he is subjective and his interpretations of the facts of history are his own — unless he has no mind of his own.

After doing away with objectivity in a cavalier manner, let us go on to impartiality. Now, what is impartiality? This is a term that I should like to substitute for objectivity. People, historians and non-historians, should use impartiality instead of objectivity.

Impartiality implies an attitude that gives the other fellow a chance to be heard. In other words, the historian, in order to be impartial, must see to it that even if he does not like the face of a fellow, he should *give* him a chance to be heard. Justice, in other words, or fairness—this is the essence of impartiality. This does not mean that we must eliminate our prejudices or bias, an impossible task, for bias is inherent in men and especially, in women. What is meant is that before a historian jumps to a conclusion, he should study not one side of the question, but *all* sides or all facets of a personality. Make the event or the personality speak eloquently as possible and, after weighing the "pros" and "cons", draw his own conclusion. The historian's conclusion may be unflattering to the other fellow, but at least he gave this fellow a chance to be heard. This is the essence of impartiality. Let us give an example. Let us say that a married woman is widely rumored to be "going steady" with another man. The rumor is so persistent and general that it is taken for a fact. A historian, coming upon this spicy rumor, writes about it with nothing as basis except the persistent rumor. He elaborates on the subject to make it more palatable to the readers, especially to those whose taste for literature is based on scandal sheets. The historian is guilty of not being impartial and, on top of it, guilty of having poor taste. An impartial historian verfies the source of his rumor, classifies the source or sources and gathers all available sources, including an interview with the woman in order to present her side, and then interprets the verified facts in accordance with his sense of justice. If the historian is a moralist, he will in all likelihood condemn the woman, if guilty, but at least he has given her a chance to be heard or, as the legalist would have it, a day in court.

The idea of suppressing and not examining with a critical eye the sources of information, is a form of distortion. Suppressing the facts in order to favor a friend, a relative or an institution to which a person belongs is one of the worst kinds of distortion, probably worse than lifting sentences out of context.

Impartiality is not easy to accomplish because (a) prejudices vary from person to person and (b) factors, such as personal relationship, moral sensibilities, and the like, exert a strong influence on the historian such that his desire to be fair or just is overwhelmed and is replaced by what I may call historical blindness. I can give example of this historical blindness from Philippine historiography, but I am afraid we have not yet come to such level of tolerance found in the European countries as to give me an assurance that I will not receive a wrapped gift box that may cause me my life. I can, however, give an example or two from European historiography to clarify my point. England's Edward Gibbon, who had no degree, wrote the great masterpiece, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* In this magnificent work of history and art, Gibbon blamed Christianity for the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. Historians of antiquity have always considered Gibbon's stricture unfair and unkind. I should add that Gibbon, despite his brilliance and literary style, had very strong prejudices, especially against Christianity, which he could not temper even by his wide culture. It is this defect in his character that mars his otherwise brilliant and well-written volumes. Still, the work remains unsurpassed. Again, there is that great German historian, the only rival of Gibbon, Theodor Mommsen, the author of the great masterpiece of historical writing, *The History of Rome,* who denounced Cicero. Gibbon's and Mommsen's are not perfect books and the reason for this is that they were not perfect. Nobody is.

The historian's task is not confined to collecting facts, nor is it limited to narrating and interpreting what actually happened. His task includes the duty to be impartial, to do justice to everybody, to put a rein, so to speak, to his wild passions, although I believe that some amount of passion should invest a historical writing in order to humanize it, for after all, history is a thoroughly, deeply human document, with flesh and blood, not dry bones alone.

Objectivity in Writing and Teaching History*

Filipinas E. Pineda

We hear creditable writers and teachers of history say there is no such thing as objectivity in history. I accepted the invitation to speak on "Objectivity in History" not only inspite of this, but precisely because of this. I believe, to the writer and the teacher of history, the point should not be whether or not there can be objectivity in history, or whether or not it is at all possible, but rather why they should be true to attain it and how much of it is their responsibility in writing and teaching.

The ultimate aim of history writing is to re-create the totality of the past without doing violence to the happenings of the actual past. To re-create the happenings is not enough, but rather it is re-creating and presenting them with truth and justice that completes our task. We should achieve a notable standard of fairness. That makes the whole of the difference between theory and the other disciplines.

Awareness of the obstacles in the attainment of objectivity would make the writer and the teacher strive to get strong incentives to impartiality. The realm of the past is so vast that a historian must select which aspects of the happenings to write about. The basis of selection is the initial, and to some extent, the most important step that makes for subjectivity.

---

* Lecture delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the Philippine Historical Association at the Teachers' Camp, Baguio City, on March 30, 1973.

Applying his own yardstick on what to choose, he actually measures the past with his own philosophy of history. This philosophy governs not only what he selects and what he omits, but what he stresses and what he minimizes. But that has to be done, for surely it is humanly impossible to really re-create the totality of the past, that is, in its entirety. The historian analyzes trends and developments that have taken place years and even centuries back from very limited sources. He makes statements singling out and summing up regularities that fit into the picture he selects from which he discerns order and pattern in the human past. It has been typical in history to stress as important those events which have long-term or far-reaching effects—events whose results affect the most number or several generations. Political power covers the biggest share of typical selection in history writing and classroom lessons—not much of religion or of poetry. Power affects us all, and poetry only a few and that men are inclined to worship power. Historians do not all concern themselves with the same thing and there are undoubtedly many past events that have received no attention from historians. Much is considered unimportant and is excluded from the picture supposedly presenting the totality of the past. What we may often have are well-defined sequences or patches separated by intervening periods considered not so important. Then how much of the writer's selected sequences are further trimmed by the teacher in classroom work? Again the teacher's subjectivity determines that—making another step away from objectively attaining re-creation of the past happenings. So much of history is doled out to the students. How much reaches them?

Then, too, as if human data are not complex enough for the writer and the teacher (and even the student) history requires something more. It requires a feeling for and insight into humanity and sense of historical time and historical concepts. Such gap of time has to be bridged particularly by the teacher to be able to transmit to the students the necessary concepts for purposes of understanding and appreciation. Even when the students have understood historical data and have formed appropriate ideas, difficulties still remain relating to the students' mode of thinking. This mode of thinking breaks down into two parts:

1. The mechanism of explanation, imagination and inference—which are to a large extent influenced by the teacher's partiality.
2. The structure of historical equilibrium and change.

The data are not readily understood, by reason both of their incompleteness and of the form in which they are presented in textbooks. Furthermore, they are made up of the doings of people much older than they and in remote times. So the need for the teacher's explanation—and hopefully, an objective explanation. In attempting at such objectivity the teacher must bear in mind that he is putting up not only something new and strange to the students, but something he cannot hope to see but is expected to understand. To communicate with them, then the teacher must associate in some way the new material with their present or previous experience. Some transfer of experience is involved: existing experiences are generalized and abstracted and applied to new material. In the process, subjectivity would make the biggest violence to the past. The teacher should not pass her own moral judgment as a fact. This can clearly be both misleading and distorting. Sooner or later her bright student will notice the source of distortion—even the less intelligent will soon find out. The risk is too great.

If history is not to be distorted, badly simplified, it is clear that the teacher has to scrutinize moral judgment as carefully as "evidence." Neither the historian nor the teacher can always be certain that his moral judgment or even attitudes are completely sound. To show an openness to discussion, argument, or revision is a part of the necessary skill, just as the wise teacher will accept correction on matters of fact. The intrusion of moral attitudes hinders objective contemplation of past events, but it is difficult to remove them completely, hence, subjectivity.

Historians possess the scholarly drive for impartiality and objectivity—I'm not sure I can easily say that of teachers. For while they tread on common grounds—history—they use an entirely different channel, the former historical writing, the latter classroom explanation. And each create an entirely different subjective world by meeting the same set of obstacles.

Both can not be objective either because they possess fundamentally different moral and metaphysical viewpoints or because they have different theories of historical interpretation. Each is a "prisoner of his own age, its climate of opinion, and interprets the past in the idiom of that age." The question of impartiality of one or the other is not a simple one.

The real obstacle to objectivity is personal bias or prejudice in whatever form it may occur. Bias may mean a judgment reached without examination or consideration of the evidence in full. It is conditioned, more often than not, by personal belief, political or religious issues and exaggeration. Bias may take the form of exaggerated view points—the writer's and the teacher's—their interpretation and explanation. None is free from bias. But, what is important is that the writer and the teacher should be aware of this and be willing to discuss opposing points of view. To get as close as possible to objectivity Shafer, in his *Guide To Historical Method*, says, and I quote, "for the writer to be humble enough to try to identify and correct biases in themselves—accept the subjectivity of his pre-conceptions and be prepared to recognize that what is valid for one may often appear invalid to another." And to minimize bias Professor Cohen in his *Meaning of Human History* wrote, again I quote, "The safeguard against bias in the writing of history . . . is not to indulge in useless resolutions to be free of bias, rather to explore one's preconceptions, to make the explicit, to consider their alternatives . . ."

Another obstacle is group prejudice. This may pose a bigger danger than personal bias because assumptions we make as a group are less easy to detect, or more subtle and widespread in their operation, and just because of their general acceptance in the group there is less urge for us to become conscious of them and so overcome them. Such is the case of ideological, religious and political camps.

Still another obstacle which poses a bigger danger are conflicting theories of historical interpretation. While both the writer and the teacher can, if they make the effort, overcome bias and group prejudice—they cannot dispense with a theory of historical interpretation. The writer, particularly, must have such theory—if he has to make any sense of his facts. He makes use of artifacts and other historical sources that possess no objective reality of their own, to which he gives meaning by adding flesh to such skeletal outline, breathing life to it—arranging facts in sequence to form a picture in the context of the past yet to be understood in the light of the present.

The purpose he has in mind will determine the meaning he gives and derives from the picture he creates. The event itself, the facts, do not say anything, do not impose any meaning. It is the historian who speaks, who imposes a meaning. Hence, the need for his theory of interpretation.

Underlying philosophical conflicts form another obstacles. They supplement conflicting theories. Whatever facts the historian has to work with are analyzed within his interpretative framework. His values are engaged; he approves and disapproves. He cannot apply a self-contained conceptual and methodological apparatus in approving and disapproving, interpreting and analyzing, for in each instance he confronts a unique constellation of forces in a unique situation. Again the intrusion of moral attitudes hinders objective contemplation. A history neither proves or disproves—but a historian cannot altogether detach himself from moral judgment. Passing moral judgment is fairly a big problem to the teacher—(probably) more than to the historian, for she is the bridge that links the contents of the book to the student's inquiring mind.

Should historians judge past actions in relation to the moral standard of the past or of the present? It seems clear that for a moral judgment to count as fair, it has to be in relation to the values of the period, as well as in the context of an actual situation and its possibilities. It is often pointed out that the "great historian" is distinguished by the way he translates the meaning of the past in relation to the present. An equally good teacher then is one who can do the same. This relation to the present is a complex aspect of history, it is not a simple utilitarian connection; it is rather the placing of the past into a context which includes the present. This weighing of a moral judgment in relation to both past and present values will include, of course, the basic principles and outlook of the historian.

It seems unlikely that the teacher can avoid moral judgments and values, but in doing so can still minimize subjectivity. In explaining political aspect of a lesson, for example, she must bear in mind that many of the political labels have subtle and varied moral connotations. They may often be conveyed not in books, but in oral teaching by, for instance, the sheer tone of the voice or the facial expression the teacher uses in discussing say, communism or democracy. From the explanation, the students may discover both the neutral and emotive meanings.

Instead of passing moral judgment outright regarding a lesson, the teacher will do well in guiding the students in making their own. This can be done by well-constructed questions and the manner and the sequence by which they are asked. On the overly-generalized statement, for example, "That the encomenderos were abusive," instead of generalizing thus that they are bad—the following questions make for objective formation of moral judgment.

On what evidence were the encomenderos considered bad?

By what standards are they judged to be bad?

Were their actions considered as bad during their time?

Can you give some reasons and principles for this judgment?

What sort of situation did they have to deal with; had they any kind of choice?

When all these have been answered, not in one theoretical swoop but at various times over many instances, the student has learned something about how to use moral judgment in history—and not merely mistake their teacher's subjective statement as the "fact."

On the other hand, the writer simply must be on the alert to ensure that the color and texture of his understanding of the "facts" are not imperceptibly affected by a sense of reality that may have become a little too fixed, by implicit theories that have become a source of ego gratification. Thus, the historian requires not only an ability to perceive his presuppositions and values and their effects on his thought but also the will to criticize his own pet ideas and to resist them where necessary. Hence it represents a triumph of the critical reason that the historian is able, in a relative and limited way, to transcend the limits of his situation and produce knowledge that deserves to be described as objective or true or valid or sound—although not in an absolute sense. Objectivity attained by the historian is a moral and intellectual achievement.

In concluding, may I say then that objectivity is the goal of both the writer and the teacher of history and that the obstacles in attaining it are not only real but numerous. Aware of this, then, it is hoped that we will be going back to our writing desk, and to our classrooms with an even greater sense of duty and responsibility.

Interpretation in History*

Teodoro A. Agoncillo

Many a time people have wondered why historians, equipped with the same educational background and possessing the same historical materials, differ widely in their views and interpretation of what are conveniently called historical facts. This act of "wondering" is premised basically on the supposition, held as infallible in certain quarters, that history, that is, history as a written account of what happened in the past, is and should be objective if its author wants to be counted among the respectable and respected practitioners of the art. I use "art" advisedly, for rightly looked upon, history is not a social science but a branch of the humanities and, therefore, belongs to the realm of literary art. In schoolrooms and in public forums, one hears quite often and, sometimes, delivered with an Olympian air one frequently associates with superiority, that to be authoritative a historian, like a mathematician, should not, must not, darken the pages of his work with his own shadow and that to do so would make him lose that supreme objectivity which, in the thinking of Cambridge classical historian, J. B. Bury, is what history should have because it is "science, no less and no more." This is the classic formulation of that school of "history as science" which has become so popular that to this day one is loathed indeed to deviate from the path already laid out for fear of being labeled an arrant fool or a black sheep. In the Philippines whose educational system has been aped from American educational system with all its theories, wholesome and unwholesome, the idea of deviating from the beaten path is anathema, with the result that today we have not evolved an educational system fit for Filipinos. Even our textbooks in history are prepared in accordance with abstruse American theories which are propounded, in the first place, for Americans.

---

* Lecture delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the National Historical Commission and the Philippine Historical Association at the University of San Carlos, Cebu City, on September 22, 1973.

These considerations come to the surface because they negate any effort on the part of some bold and unorthodox people to introduce significant reforms not only in the educational system of the country, but also in the thinking of the students and, most importantly, in that of the teachers of history who should be the first, not the last, to make history-as-subject something to cherish and to love. If history-as-subject today is a dreaded subject in schools and colleges, it is because teachers as a rule emphasize dates as *the* core of history which must be memorized by their students. A student is supposed to be bright if he has memorized all the dates in the textbook. In college, the teachers, in "briefing" their students about the term papers to be prepared, usually emphasize the objectivity of history as more important than the quality of the student's materials or of his writing. This dehumanization of history has been the bane both of history-as-work and history-as-subject. It is not infrequent to hear students, in high school as well as in college, to remark that they hate history because they have to memorize so many dates. "I am not good in history," said one physician to me not long ago, "because I have a very poor memory for dates." "Memory for dates"—this phrase sums us many people's idea of history-as-subject. One hears quite too often the dubious praise "He is good in history" which, in essence, means the fellow referred to has a good memory for dates. As to interpretation, this is one of those activities of the mind which does not receive the attention it deserves. Interpretation in history is discouraged because it is subjective, and subjectivity implies being personal, being biased or prejudiced. Interpretation gives many people intellectual discomfort, in much the same way that heartburn gives one physical discomfort.

I started by implying that interpretation is implicit in any study of historical materials. This is valid only by assuming that all historians are not afraid to pass through the difficult process of interpretation after assessing their materials. Using the same materials, why do historians differ in their interpretation? This question cannot be answered without going into the idea of objectivity in history, for interpretation is a highly personal matter. Historical facts do not interpret themselves. They are, as the historian Carl L. Becker long ago made obvious, the shadows of past actual events which are gone and cannot be made to appear again as they actually happened. Nor is it possible to summon everything in the past in order to complete the accounting of events. The facts dealt with in a historical work are but a speck in the boundless sky, an insignificant portion of what actually happened. Consequently, the historian can base his interpretation only on a very small portion of actuality. It is for this reason that there cannot be any finality or completeness in historical conclusions. Every historical conclusion is tentative and is valid only for the duration of his facts. When so-called new facts come to light through assiduous research, facts which contradict or modify the nature of the previously known facts, then another conclusion based on these "new" facts will of necessity be drawn, and so on till eternity. This is one of the reasons why interpretation in history varies from age to age and from person to person, and why history is constantly being re-written.

I asked the question why historians differ in their interpretation of the same set of facts. If history as a written work is objective, that is, without the personal prejudices or opinions of the historian intruding into his work, then it is logical to conclude that *all* interpretations of the same set of facts must be the same. But experience shows that historians differ from one another most of the time and agree only on certain points. The divergence among them is so wide that oftentimes some people do not know whom and what to believe., A certain Ph.D. in history was so confused that he compiled what he alleged to be "inconsistencies" in the works of our historical writers. There are, of course, no inconsistencies in the works of the historical writers mentioned but only differences in interpretation or opinions. A layman's confusion is understandable and, therefore, may be forgiven, but a history major's confusion is, to say the least, surprising. In the face of differing opinions, a history major should have the common sense to make his own research and to draw his own conclusion regarding the subject under dispute. As far as a layman is concerned, what he should do in the face of conflicting opinions is to use his native intelligence by studying carefully the given facts and then drawing his own conclusion which may be different from those of the authors he has read. I do not fear that any confusion will result from such an intellectual exercise. The confusion will be in the heads of those who have never been accustomed to thinking for themselves. The beauty of history-as-subject and as a species of writing lies in the variety of interpretation. Any attempt to secure or impose only one interpretation is a malicious attempt on the life of history itself. One can imagine the dullness of all history books which have the same interpretation, the same conclusion, and the same approach to the same subject.

Some people fear that allowing one's self the exercise of the right to interpret facts might lead to unconscious or subconscious bias which, they say, should be avoided. This mortal fear of interpretation because of the fear of being prejudiced will naturally lead to making history-writing a mere physical exercise devoid of ideas, color, and atmosphere. This is not history in the real sense of the word, but mere chronology, a calendar, if you will. I believe that any historian worth the the name should not fear bias or prejudice; as a matter of fact, he should be open about it and not try to hide his bias under false pretenses. The historian is a human being, deeply human, and, like all others about him, capable of feeling the pangs of sorrow, the sweetness of joy, the pride of victory, and everything that makes life a drama being played on the stage. What a historian should avoid is the telling of deliberate falsehood or the twisting of facts to suit his personal or group interests. Fact-twisting is either deliberate or unintentional. It is deliberate if its motive is base and results in distortion. It is unintentional if it is the result of ignorance or stupidity or both. In either case, the historian who is guilty of fact-twisting or distortion has no place in a profession which lays so much emphasis and value on intellectual honesty.

What the historian should strive mightily to attain is impartiality, which is not the same as objectivity. To be impartial is to be fair. In objectivity, the historian is supposed to detach himself from any entanglement with what he is writing in order to avoid intruding himself into the picture. In impartiality, the historian is asked to look at all possible sides or angles of a question. Having given all sides an airing, so to speak, the historian is asked to draw his own conclusion which, necessarily, will favor one or the other. But in favoring one side, he cannot be judged unfair or partial since he exerted efforts to present all sides of the question. His conclusion may show his bias, which is natural in any person, but he cannot be properly accused of being unfair. The historian is like a judge in some ways in that like a judge, he listens to all arguments of both sides and then renders his judgment or decision. But the historian, unlike a judge, has the right to consider all pieces of evidence relevant to his subject and is not inhibited by any law which excludes evidence acquired through unlawful means, such as wiretapping, eavesdropping, and the like. Moreover, the historian unlike a judge, is prosecuting attorney, defense attorney, detective, witness, and judge rolled into one. In this sense, the role of the historian is not only electic, but dramatic.

Since the historian is human and being human has weaknesses as well as strength, he should strive at all times and under any circumstances to be impartial in the treatment of the subjects that come within his ken. Let him not fool himself into believing that he could attain objectivity like a mathematician. Objectivity is an ideal devoutly to be wished but it is an ideal and, therefore, unattainable. The best thing to do considering the circumstances he is in, is to admit that he is capable of erring, of having passions and prejudices, hate and love, and sympathy and antipathy. Because he is conditioned by all these and by his heritage and his surroundings, he cannot hope to be detached, much as he would like to be detached, like an impassive, unfeeling object hovering over suffering humanity. It is because of these conditioning factors that historians differ from one another in their opinions, biases, approach, and style. There are other conditioning factors, such as the degree of sensitivity, sharpness of feeling, keenness of insight, range and depth of vision, and, not the least, the ability to express ideas and feelings with precision and clarity. These factors, taken together, form a natural and massive bulwark against the attainment of unanimity among historians.

Let me now pass from observation to practical considerations. Anybody who has read the works of our historical writers will easily notice the differences in their opinions, their style, and their approach. Some are decidedly pro-Spanish, others are unashamedly pro-American, and a few others are diffidently pro-Filipino. There was, as a matter of record, a Catholic history of the Philippines. To date, I have not come across a pro-Iglesia ni Cristo, a pro-Protestant, a pro-Aglipayan, and a pro-Muslim history of the Philippines. I hope I may not see the day when this kind of history books will grace the bookshelves of individuals and schools. They may be flattering to a group of vested interest, but they do the vested interest more harm than good. In the final analysis, works of history, like works of art, will be judged by posterity on the basis not only of accuracy and style of writing, but more so of integrity. For the historian as artist must have deep convictions not attuned to popular fallacies and myths, nor to popular beliefs and traditional views, but to truth as he sees it in historical materials. It is this integrity of the historian, no less than the integrity of artists in general, that counts most in the long run. And the "long run" judges more accurately and dispassionately than the "short run" because it is not fettered by the tyranny of current fashion and current prejudices. A historian who lacks integrity is no better than a common streetwalker, for while the latter has no reputation to protect, nor honor to uphold, the historian, on the other hand, has a reputation he won upon entering the field of historical scholarship and swore he would cherish and protect it. By electing to be an intellectual prostitute, either because of his ardent wish to be in the good graces of some gods, holy and unholy, or to make of his profession a lucrative business, he deliberately places himself beneath a streetwalker's professional dignity and thus forever disqualifies himself from receiving the favors of Clio.

It might be asked how interpretation can be deduced or extracted from a mass of materials. There is no formula on how to interpret. It will all depend on the ability of the historian. Thus, a historian who has a wider and deeper experience, a keener insight, a wider range of vision, and better writing qualities, has more chances of interpreting his facts intelligently than one who is good only at compiling data and using a pair of scissors and a bottle of paste. The interpretative aspect of history writing is most difficult, for it requires of a historian that he be a humanist and a philosopher. Gathering data, or spade work, is only physically arduous and requires just enough intelligence to put relevant facts together and to classify them. It is inferior, very much inferior, to the interpretative aspect and can be undertaken by an average undergraduate. As a matter of fact, some so-called scholars do not undertake actual research themselves—they hire undergraduates, or those recently graduated, to do the research for them. I do not consider scholars those who make others do the "dirty jobs" for them, for they deny to themselves the joy and excitement of facing and solving problems connected with actual research. More than this, a "scholar" who does not personally undertake researches cannot hope to interpret intelligently the facts presented to him by his hired researcher. If the actual researcher commits mistakes, or omits relevant data which only his employer can determine for himself, then the employer's interpretation, if any, will be off the mark or, at best, dubious. Consequently, a scholar must undertake the research himself and not relegate this delicate job to a researcher whose interest is, generally, pecuniary. Assistants are needed only for running errands for the employer and such chores as would not affect the integrity of the scholar.

One often hears someone saying that he disagrees with, say, Juan, on this point because Juan is wrong. Which means that he does not accept Juan's interpretation of an event or set of facts. I believe that on questions of interpretation one is not justified in saying that another fellow is wrong. Interpretation is not right or wrong; it may be valid or invalid, likely or dubious, good or bad, sensible or foolish. The validity of an interpretation of a set of facts rests in its closeness and relevance to the given facts. Any interpretation that does not issue from the given facts or which is contradicted by these, is either invalid or foolish. Interpretation, therefore, must not go beyond what the facts indicate or beyond the intention of a witness. Any attempt to go beyond the intention or context of the facts is sheer fantasy. I remember my boyhood days when Tagalog poets and writers, including those involved in the writing of Philippine history, used to shout on the stage during the Rizal Day celebrations that Rizal's novels constituted the Filipino people's Bible and that they paved the way for the Revolution of 1896. Everybody accepted this interpretation. To this day, it is still cherished with nostalgia by the traditionalist historical writers. I will not say that this interpretation is wrong; any interpretation of Rizal's novels is as good or as bad as any other. But do the facts of the Philippine Revolution justify the claim? If so, then Rizal, were he alive today, would feel sorry for himself for having caused the bloodbath that he denounced so heartily. He would probably repent having written his novels, assuming, of course, that his fiction was responsible for the Revolution.

I should like to give another example from Philippine history of an interpretation that is dubious but not necessarily wrong. I refer to a Marxist's interpretation that Bonifacio represented the revolutionary force and Aguinaldo the anti-revolutionary force. I find no justification in presenting an ideological polarity with reference to the two great heroes of the Revoluton. Aguinaldo was not only a revolutionary but also a revolutionist. So was Bonifacio. Both believed in revolution as the only way, in the context of the period, of solving the Philippine problem. Aguinaldo could not have been a counter-revolutionary, for he favored the radical steps taken by Bonifacio to bring about the Revolution. He and Bonifacio differed not in ideology, but in dealing with those who commited mistakes in the revolutionary camp. Bonifaco was for punishing them severely; Aguinaldo was for a humane treatment of the erring Filipinos in order not to divide the ranks of the revolutionists. I see no ideological polarity here but only a simple case of disagreement.

These two examples, I hope, have made my point clear, namely, that interpretation should not be labeled right or wrong, but valid or invalid, sensible or foolish, likely or dubious, good or bad. It is the height of presumptuousness to tag a fellow wrong in his interpretation of facts simply because his is different from the rest. For all we know, his interpretation may live longer than ours and may as such be accepted by posterity as the most sensible of all interpretations.

Imagination in History*

Teodoro A. Agoncillo

To any historian worthy of the name, imagination is as important and necessary in the writing of history as it is in the writing of fiction, drama, or poetry. Yet in the Philippines at least, there is a widespread view, held by those who, in the memorable words of George Bernard Shaw, cannot write and, therefore, teach, that imagination in history is something to be deplored since history deals primarily and supremely with facts. There is in this view an implied contempt for an element of historical writing without which history will degenerate into mere cataloguing. When laid bare with a mental scalpel the view is exposed to be nothing more than a gross misunderstanding of the nature of history as a testament of past ages. This is because history, properly looked upon, is not a matter of compiling and reciting facts, of marshalling them in a time-sequence, and of allowing them to speak for themselves—as if facts speak for themselves—but infinitely much more. It is a re-creation of the past in such a manner as to provide not only the bones, but also the flesh and blood of those moments which once were here but are now only memories. As such, it provides the reader, within the range allowed by competent and verified sources, with an accurate approximation of the past, which is the concern of history. To write this kind of history requires a disciplined imagination and the ability to write with lucidity and with literary freshness. History thus conceived is a creative endeavor.

---

* Paper read in the Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at the Immaculate Conception College, Davao City, on March 23, 1972.

The ordeal of the historian begins not with its scientific aspects—the spade work and the cataloguing of what may be termed facts—but with its artistic aspect. Having gathered his materials, the historian views and reviews his facts with feeling, nay, with passion, and tries to visualize them in such a way as to fit each of them into its proper place or setting in the narrative. It is in the review of his facts that the historian employs the historical imagination to the fullest extent allowed by his sources. One might say that the facts are conditioned by the historian's imagination, and the imagination is conditioned by the facts. The two are inseparable and one cannot be wrenched from the other without seriously affecting history as a finished product. Interpretation, which is an aspect of historical imagination, bears upon the facts in such a way that the latter becomes the tool, not the master, of the historian. This is obviously shown when two or more historians, given the same set of facts, arrive at different conclusions or offer different interpretation. On the other hand, imagination not based on facts, or on fringes of facts, is wild and does not legitimately form any aspect of the historical imagination. It is in this area of the imagination where the historian is less fortunate than his literary colleague, whether the latter is a poet, a dramatist, or a fictionist. The creative writer's imagination is free to roam and to explore the conscious and the subconscious, or even the unconscious, without being questioned as to its basis in actuality. Thus, a fictionist may not use actual incidents or happenings to weave a plot for a novel or a short story. Or he may use actual incidents as the core of his plot but modify them—adding here, suppressing there—in order to suit his literary purpose. Nobody questions him regarding the veracity or actuality of the incidents he narrates in his story. This kind of freedom is not vouchsafed the historian, for his imagination, unlike the literary imagination, is fettered by the facts or the actual events. Any deviation from actuality would inevitably transmute history into imaginative literature.

I have been taught in college that imagination should not be employed in the service of the historian and that the historian's task was—and is—the narration of events without any embellishment. "Let the facts speak for themselves," I was warned by one of my professors who in his day was famous for being the author of a little book on Philippine history which we used in the Seventh Grade. Looking back at those days, I cannot help feeling that with all his learning my former professor had a narrow view of history. History as actuality is partially recaptured by the historian through a careful and judicious use of data. Since history as a species of writing is a re-creation of the past, as much as the available and verified facts allow, it is certain that written history can approximate the past only if the historian is endowed with a lively imagination which recaptures, even in capsule form, the color, the atmosphere, the action of past actuality. I said that past actuality can be recaptured only partially, for the function of the historian is not to narrate every event that happened to every man every day of his life. To do so is not only to fall into absurdity but also to perform Sisyphus's task. It is for this reason that there is no such thing as complete history. To say, as some book reviewers do, that a certain history book is the *most complete* is to be stupid. There is not even a *complete* history to speak of, for not only does the historian chooses his facts out of the innumerable facts that constitute history, but also because no man or superman can ever hope to read even one half of all available documents on any particular subject.

Historical imagination has several aspects each of which is relevant to and necessary in the partial recreation of the past.

Let me begin with what may be termed imaginative understanding. When a historian has finished gathering his data or facts, he does not immediately piece them together in chronological or topical order but studies them thoroughly and intensely in order to go into or to participate in the events or in the lives of men he intends to write about. This is the kind of immersion that the historian undergoes before sitting down to write. In the explanation of men and events it is not enough to rely on documents, for documents, while important, leave out many things that men did, said and thought. They are the bones of history, but the flesh and blood must be supplied by the historian through the judicious use of his imagination. Thus, while the documents are silent on why General Emilio Aguinaldo, after coming to terms, through Pedro A. Paterno, with Governor General Fernando Primo de Rivera in the now historic Truce of Biyak-na-Bato, continued to harbor revolutionary ideas and, in fact, kept the truce money for purposes other than those contemplated in the agreement, one is nevertheless led to the conclusion, on the basis of Aguinaldo's actions, that he had no faith in Spanish promises. The conclusion is arrived at through the historian's imaginative understanding of Aguinaldo's psychology and the antecedent and surrounding circumstances. Without this imaginative understanding, it would be impossible for any historian to communicate with his subjects and, ultimately, to re-live the past. The historian, therefore, must exert serious efforts to understand the mind and character of the person he is to write about if he is to make the portrait of the man as close as possible to the original. In the words of Cambridge Professor E. H. Carr, "History cannot be written unless the historian can achieve some kind of contact with the mind of those about whom he is writing."[1]

The historical understanding that establishes contact between the historian and his subject has its basis in logical imperative, which is to say, that the imagination is anchored not upon some personal fantasy or whim, but upon a reasoning that issues from the nature of the subject under study. Thus, Aguinaldo, who had experienced Spanish duplicity before, could not help suspecting inwardly that the Spanish authorities, by offering money to get rid of him, had no intention of keeping his promise. He might have been wrong in his suspicions, but this is beside the point. What matters is that by his actions Aguinaldo showed he had no intention of abiding by the agreement he concluded with Primo de Rivera through Paterno. He did not intend to honor the agreement because his previous experience with the Spaniards gave him a warning signal, so to speak, not to rely on promises.

The question may be raised whether an event or a man's action may warrant two or more interpretations by the use of historical imagination. If so, would not this aspect of historical imagination be a liability rather than an asset in writing history? The answer to the first question is yes; to the second, no. It is a truism that no two historians, confronted with the same set of facts, would arrive at exactly the same conclusion or have the same interpretation. The reason for this is that historians differ as much in their personality as in their background and mental makeup. Consequently, their interpretations differ from each other, even assuming that they employ the same aspect of historical imagination. The beauty, not necessarily the validity, of their interpretations also varies in proportion to their ability to write effectively and clearly. As to the validity of their interpretations no same person would be so rash as to arrogate to himself the exclusive authority to determine which interpretation is valid, for the validity of an interpretation lies not so much in the stated or given facts as in the temper and mood of a particular period. Which is also saying that each generation writes its own history and contributes its own interpretations which are different from those of the preceding generation. It is for this reason that what is valid today may not be valid tomorrow, or what may not be valid today may be valid in the suceeding era. Since history is continually being rewritten by successive epochs, it follows that there cannot be any finality in historical conclusions.

---

[1] E. H. Carr. *What is History?* (London, Penguin Books, 1964), p. 24.

There is another aspect of historical imagination which the British philosopher-historian, R. G. Collingwood, called "interpolation."[2] This is an insertion of statements between those made by a historian's authorities or sources. Thus, for instance, a contemporary account may contain a statement to the effect that General Aguinaldo was in Cavite on such a day and in Biyak-na-Bato on another day. Obviously, there is a gap between the two dates. It is in the use of this aspect of historical imagination that the historian inserts his own statements which are merely implied in the authorities or sources. Interpolation reconstruct, for example, the event or events that occurred between Aguinaldo's stay in Cavite on a certain definite day and his arrival at Biyak-na-bato on another day. The reconstruction, in this case, is not arbitrary in the sense that the interpolated material or statements are the natural consequence of the evidence. Suppose we say that General Aguinaldo travelled on foot from Cavite to Biyak-na-bato. This interpolation is not arbitrary because experience and knowledge of the terrain show that it was impossible for any man to sail a ship or to ride horses since, according to contemporary accounts, Aguinaldo wanted his departure from Cavite kept secret, even from the townspeople along the route to Biyak-na-bato. The use of horses would have been fool-hardy, for the movements of the revolutionists could not, in the circumstances, have been kept from the people along the route from Cavite to Biyak-na-bato. The use of a ship, on the other hand, is fantastic and belongs to that species of composition made famous by the Grimm brothers.

---

[2] R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (New York, Orford University Press, 1956), p. 240.

On the other hand, it is not historical imagination to write. by way of interpolation, that Aguinaldo met this or that man and conversed with him for an hour or so. This is so because neither Aguinaldo nor the contemporary accounts mention such a conversation. Therefore any interpolation that is not necessitated by the evidence is not historical imagination but a literary one such as that employed by fictionists, poets, dramatist, and historical novelists.

Allied to this aspect of imagination, but dangerous in practice, is the re-creation of atmosphere or setting. The difficulty of employing this aspect of historical imagination lies not so much in the absence of documentary evidence as in the lack of restraint on the part of the historian. His success in employing this device depends primarily upon prior knowledge of a particular scene in its historical setting. Ignorance of the setting should inhibit the historian from employing this device. The prime requisite, therefore, in the successful use of this device or technique is prior knowledge of the scene not only at a particular time, but at subsequent times. In the *Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan*, I described the atmosphere that surrounded the Tejeros Convention of 22 March 1897, **thus:**[3]

> The delegates, mostly belonging to the Magdiwang, lazily trooped

---

[3] Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *The **Revolt** of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan* (Quezon City, University of the Philippines, 1956), p. 208.

> that sultry afternoon to the spacious estate-house of Tejeros... They came from all directions: from Kawit, Noveleta and Imus to the north; from Tanza to the west; and from San Francisco de Malabon to the northeast.

No contemporary account of the meeting of Tejeros mention the afternoon to be sultry, nor the directions the delegates took in going to the former friar's estate-house. It was, however, 22 March and experience shows that late March in the Philippines is the beginning of the hot season. As to the directions taken by the delegates. common sense tells us that no direction other than those mentioned could have been taken. In both instances, the imagination follows the logic of the situation. The absence, moreover, of any account, written or oral, about a shower having fallen in the afternoon of that particular day justified my description.

The same technique was used by Catherine Drinker Bowen in her celebrated biography of the great American jurist, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. She wrote:[4]

> On the evening of her husband's birthday—March 8, 1881—Fanny Holmes brought out a bottle of champagne. She and Holmes drank it, toasting *The Common Law,* toasting its author. Draining his glass, Holmes picked up the empty bottle, carried it to the sink. He held the cork a moment in his fingers, turned it over. Outside, March winds, whirling up the hill across the stones in Grany Burying Ground, shook the windows....

And again:

> Holmes got his hat and coat. The two walked down the steps of Dane Hall, turned left on Harvard Square toward the president's house. The sky was brilliant blue. Gusts of dry snow, blowing along the bricks, touched their faces.

It is obvious that Bowen used her lively imagination to recreate the local color of a particular place and time which does not appear in any document or eyewitness account. One does not have to rely, however, on documents to show, first, that the month of March in the United States along the Atlantic seaboard is late winter or beginning of spring and that during this time of the year winds blow hard enough to shake the windows; and, second, that in December, the month of the second scene, snow falls on the ground. The author, then, is justified in re-creating the atmosphere of the two scenes described above, because experience shows that winds and snow are invariably connected with winter. The use of this aspect of historical imagination is important not only in literature, but also in history. For history is not a mere compilation of cut-and-dried facts and piled one on top of another, but a re-creation of what the historian believes to be significant events based not only on documents, or first-hand accounts, but also on common experience. To the matter-of-fact writer of history whose imagination is either submerged or inhibited, such descriptive passages as Bowen's are nothing but embellishments whose use is not only unjustified but useless. It is such beliefs as this on the part of a great majority of writers of history books that drove—and still drives—people to read fictionized history or journalistic history. History, to be worthy of its name, must be written with imagination, with verve and color as primary sources would allow. It is no wonder that the best history books have been written not by candidates for a Ph.D. degree and by unimaginative chroniclers, but by writers with a sense of life—writers like James Gibbon, Theodor Mommsen, Thomas B. Macaulay, Francis Parkman and a few others who have made history writing an art. Witness once more this beautiful passage from Francis Parkman, one of the greatest American historians:[5]

---

[4] Catherine Drinker Bowen, *Yankee from Olympus* (Boston, Little Brown and Company, 1944), p. 284.

> . . . More than eight months had passed since the catastrophe of St. Joseph. The winter was over, and the dreariest of seasons had come. the churlish forerunner of spring. Around Saint Marie the forests were grey and bare, and, in the cornfields, the cozy, half-thawed soil, studded with sodden stalks of the last autumn's harvest, showed itself in patches through the melting snow . . .

Parkman's beautiful description of the desolate scene is not based on any documentary evidence or eyewitness account, but anybody with a keen eye for detail cannot fail to note that the forests are grey and bare after winter and that in the fields such as those Parkman described one could see the sodden stalks showing themselves through the melting snow. This is a common experience shared by most, if not all, Americans with two keen eyes, an experience that has not been changed by vicissitudes.

---

[5] Quoted in George F. Kennan, "History as Literature," *Encounter* (April 1959), p. 12.

A similar experience led George F. Kennan, an American diplomat, to describe vividly a World War I scene on the Russo-Finnish border that he did not actually witness or read from any firsthand account. On the last page of his book, *The Decision to Intervene,* he wrote:

> For an hour and a half Wardwell and Davidson sat forlornly on the railway ties of the little bridge . . . confined between the two strife-torn worlds of thought and feeling which no one had been able to hold together.
>
> This was a moment which, in view of the danger and strain and anxiety of the recent weeks, one had long looked forward; yet now that it was here it was like a death. The sky was leaden; a cold wind blew from the northwest. The wooden shelter on the Finnish side was deserted. Above, on the Soviet side, the figure of a Red Guard, rifle slung on shoulder, greatcoat collar turned up against the wind, was silhouetted against the low scudding clouds. The little stream, hurrying to the Gulf of Finland, swirled past the wooden pilings and carried its eddies swiftly and silently away into the swamps below. Along the Soviet bank a tethered nanny goat, indifferent to all the ruin and all the tragedy, nibbled patiently at the sparse dying foliage . . .

Kennan did not actually witness the scene he described in his book; nor had he any documentary evidence to prove his statement about the cold wind blowing from the northwest, or that the greatcoat collar of the Red guard was "turned up against the wind," or that a tethered nanny goat "nibbled patiently at the sparse dying foliage" and such other details of a winter scene near the Russo-Finnish frontier. To the unimaginative, Kennan is guilty of writing fiction into history. But let us hear Kennan's plea. While admitting that he had no documentary evidence to support his vivid description, he was nevertheless familiar with the scene and, in fact, never saw such a scene in Russia without a nanny goat. He had crossed the same border at precisely the same time of the year several times and always saw that a goat was always tethered at the same place nibbling at the sparse foliage. Since such a scene was—and is—constant, Kennan concluded that it could not have been otherwise. Had he not been to Russia, and more explicitly, to that particular place at that particular time, his description, no matter how vivid, would have been invalid as a historical construct.

Constancy, or invariability, of a scene, therefore, is a primary factor to be considered in determining the validity or "historicity" of a description. On the basis of this assumption, the last part of the following description cannot be accepted as valid:[6]

> On Easter Sunday, March 31, 1521, mass was celebrated in Limasawa, attended by Magellan, Rajah Siago, and their men . . . The straight brown trunks of the palm trees stood around them like columns of a choir; through the dark leaves the yellow sunlight fell in moving splashes on the vestment of Rev. Pedro de Valderrama . . . The people of the village stood at a respectful distance, watching breathlessly, their eyes bright with excitement. There was no sound but the voice of the priests; not a leaf stirred in the green forest.

Pigafetta, the chronicler of the Magellan expedition, is matter-of-fact on this point. The author of the preceding passage has definitely improved upon the ancient chronicler. I can believe, and accept, the description of the straight coconut trees and the sunlight falling "in moving splashes on the vestment of the Rev. Pedro de Valderrama" and that the people, naive and not surprisingly awestruck, were standing silently, "their eyes bright with excitement"—for, after all, the Roman Catholic Mass, the most poetic symbolism ever invented by the human mind, was a novelty to them. But I cannot accept the description that "there was no sound but the voice of the priest" and that "not a leaf stirred in the green forest." The possibility, even the probability, of absolute silence is questionable, for it is a common experience that outdoors, absolute silence cannot be attained. Experience shows that even in a hot summer day in the Philippines soft winds blow and, blowing, rustle the leaves of trees. When, on top of this, one considers that the first Mass in the Philippines was said near the Limasawa beach, one is indeed constrained to reject the author's description as invalid and, therefore, unhistorical. Here the author's imagination passes from the historical to the artistic. There was a time, more than fifty years ago, when the writing of history was considered a science. The advance of the scientific spirit, particularly after Darwin, led to the adoption of the posivistic doctrine of the scientific method in history. Historical methodology was taught and studied with an enthusiasm that was worthy of a scientist working laboriously in his laboratory to discover some law of Nature. The university classroom became the center of the "new" history whose orientation was based on absolute accuracy and narrow specialization. The obsession of the academic historians was the mechanics of history, and, thus obsessed they forgot or deliberately submerged the equally important element of art in history. The result was deplorable: while it led to more and more knowledge of the less and less, it also atrophied the artistic function of the historian. This, in turn, resulted in a plethora of unreadable and unread history books and dissertations which gathered dust in the stacks. I was one of those innumerable students who suffered from such books. It was only after leaving college that I began to study Gibbon, Mommsen, Prescott, Macaulay, Trevelyan, Parkman, and a few others who have made the writing of history an art. Mere reliable history books which have no art in them have their uses, but in the history of historiography they have very little, if any, value.

---

[6] Gregorio F. Zaide, *Philippine History and Civilization* (Manila, 1939), p. 104.

The danger of overemphasizing the value of accurate but nevertheless dull and uninspired history books—or nonbooks—lies in this: that it tends to stifle the creative spirit of the students whose minds are drowned by facts and facts and yet more facts without being allowed to weave them into an artistic whole. It is unwise, I suppose, to insist that the young students should be taught only how to gather facts. how to verify them, and how to string them together like beads of a rosary. It is equally important, to my mind, to develop the student's artistic sense. For history, in the sense that it is an accurate record and interpretation of the past, is more of humanities than of science. The only scientific part of history is that which deals with spade work and the sifting of facts; the rest belongs to the humanities. It is for this reason that I consider the discipline of history not a part of the social sciences but of the humanities.

Let me end by quoting two great historians, each a recognized master in his own field. Said Ernest Renan, the great French biographer of Jesus Christ:[7]

> History is not one of those studies of antiquity called *umbratiles*, for which a calm mind and industrious habits suffice. It touches the deep-problems of human life; it requires the whole man with all his passions. Soul is as necessary to it as to a poem or work of art, and the individuality of the writer should be reflected in it.

George Macaulay Trevelyan, the brilliant historian of nineteenth-century Britain, wrote:[8]

> . . . The poetry of history does not consist of imagination roaming at large, but of imagination pursuing the fact and fastening upon it. . . . Just because it really happened, it gathers around it all the inscrutable mystery of life and death and time. Let the science and research of the historian find the fact, and let his imagination and art make clear its significance.

---

[7] Quoted in Emery Neff, *The Poetry of History* (New York & London, Columbia University Press, 1961), p. 162.

[8] Quoted in *Ibid.* facing title page.

Philippine Historiography As a Tool for Understanding *

Gabriel F. Fabella

THE MAIN THEME of this seminar or convention is "The Study and Teaching of History", but my specific topic is "Philippine Historiography as a Tool for Understanding." My emphasis then is historiography as a means of understanding history. At first I thought that historiography has a definite characteristics and techniques that are common, but I realize that the science is too young in our country so much so that it was only in 1888 or 1889 that a Filipino started writing history according to accepted rules. Dr. Encarnacion Alzona is convinced that Jose Rizal's commentaries on Antonio de Morga's *Sucesos de las islas filipinas* entitles him to be considered the "Father of Philippine Historiography."[1] This does not mean that Rizal was the first Filipino to write some sort of history or historical tract on the Philippines. Actually Pedro A. Paterno who stayed in Spain for a little twenty years and obtained two doctorate degrees, wrote *La Civilizacion Tagala* in 1887, *Los Itas* in 1890, and other works.[2]

---

* Lecture delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the Philippine Historical Association at the Teachers' Camp, Baguio City, on March 30, 1973.

[1] Dr. Encarnacion Alzona's talk during the first international congress of Asian scholars under the auspices of the Philippine Historical Association in 1960 at the City of Manila. Professor Nicolas Zafra highly commended Alzona for it.

[2] Paterno wrote a novel that he called *Ninay*, and other works like *El*

It is not necessary then for me to deal much on the history teacher, his qualifications, his preparations and training, and the methods of teaching history, for those topics have already been discussed by previous lecturers. All that I could insinuate is that to be a good teacher of history, one must become familiar with the intricacies of historiography, and perhaps later write a historical work, a book or monograph. In this way he might even become a historian.

Let us start this lecture with definitions. Webster's *New International Dictionary* has three definitions of "historiography": (1) the art or employment, or the work of a historiographer; (2) the writing of history; (3) the study and criticism of the sources and development of history, as a branch of knowledge. *The American Heritage of the English Language* (1971) says: (1) the principles or methodology of historical study; (2) writing of history; historical literature.

From these definitions we learn that historiography simply means "the writing of history", its processes, techniques and everything connected with the training and practice of historiography. A historian then is one most specially involved in what is generally known as the historical method.

Dr. Henry Johnson says that there are two kinds of opetion in the historical method, namely, *criticism* and *synthesis*.[3] These terms require explanations. *Criticism*, historical criticism that is, refers to source materials, or simply *sources*, without which there could be no history. Historians do not invent the facts of history unlike writers of fiction. Facts are gleaned from definite sources of information, which mean generally testimonies of persons who were in positions to know the facts. Of course, some sources are mute like artifacts, and material survivals of past conditions and/or events, that is to say archaeological remains.[4] History depends primarily

---

Barangay, Los Tagalog, Aurora Social, El Alma Filipino, etc. In 1894 Paterno returned to the Philippines and was appointed Director of the Library and Museum of the Philippines. His greatest title to fame was his role as negotiator of the Truce of Biak-na-Bato which he described in a book *El Pacto de Biyak-na-Bato* in which he exaggerated himself. Read G. F. Fabella, "Pedro A. Paterno: Peacemaker", *Philippines Free Press*, Vol. XLIX, March 1, 1958.

[3] *The Teaching of History* is a recognized authority on the subject.

[4] Wilhelm G. Solheim, *The Archaeology of Central Philippines*, Manila 1964.

upon written accounts of witnesses. Since many of them are not necessarily careful observers, it is necessary to analyze each source for whatever it is worth. In fact, a good many of the so-called sources are very unreliable, and may be of no value to researchers. The discriminating scholar has difficulty in determining the usefulness of "sources."

The historical researcher may be likened to a judge in a court of justice. He listens to all the statements of the witnesses, and after weighing the evidence, decides what the true facts of the case are. From the facts presented and accepted by the judge, he makes an opinion or verdict. And that is why a professor of history at the University of the Philippines had to take in the College of Law that difficult course entitled "Law of Evidence." He turned out to be a very careful historian, and it would be advisable for some of you to emulate his example.[5]

Let us now turn to historical criticism which, according to Henry Johnson has two aspects *external* and *internal*. The first seeks to ascertain *when, where,* and *by whom,* a source is produced, and to determine exactly its original form. To make this point clear, let us suppose that we see a new book for the first time. What do we do? We try to find out who the author is—whether or not he is in a position to write such a book. What are his qualifications Is he a holder of the master's or a doctorate degree? What are his experiences in writing or teaching the subject? Where was the book published, and when? Is the book published a long time ago so that it might already be obsolete in the interpretation of facts and events in the light of newly discovered evidences? These and similar questions come up for consideration in the mind of the examiner of the book. These are parts of *external criticism.*

The next step is what is known as *internal criticism* of the source material. This is often called higher criticism because it determines the meaning or meanings of words used in the source materials. We should remember that meanings of words change from time to time and the examiners of the sources should know the meanings of words at the time the source was produced. Believers on the theory of evolution maintain that the biblical account of creation must be wrong if the meaning of the word "day" is twenty-four hours as we believe it today. If the meaning of the word "day" is one thousand years, or a milleneum, the bible might be correct. To them six days is too short for the evolution of everything in this whole universe.

---

[5] Professor Nicolas Zafra former head of the Department of History of the Philippines.

When the facts of history had been determined by criticism, external and internal, the researcher may take the final step called *synthesis*. This means the construction from the facts a body of related knowledge, and this could be attained only after a careful selection, grouping, generalization and organization of the facts.

The processes and technicalities of historiography are so complicated that separate courses are being offered in the state and other universities. The elementary course prepares students to write term papers which most students hate because of too much time used and great efforts made particularly, in the preparation of the thesis for the master's degree. Candidates for the degree were even willing to pay as much as a thousand pesos for the preparation and writing of the thesis, and there were "professionals" who earned money in this way.

What has just been cited to you is a very bad reflection of an undesirable practice of some student-teachers. They are lazy to undertake research, and rather than undergo the hardships of the intricate process they hire professionals for that purpose. Announcements of some private schools sometimes say "Mr. So and So has completed all academic units for the Master of Arts degree," while other propaganda papers acknowledge that Mr. X is a "Master of Arts without thesis."

Dr. Dalmacio Martin used to say that the master's degree in this country is a disgrace, a matter of *pasikatation*, or a pretext to gain a higher salary in the public schools in accordance with provisions of the WAPCO.[5]

---

[5] Dr. Dalmacio Martin was former Division Superintendent of Pangasinan, later was head of the academic division of the Department of Education. He also served as president of the Philippine Historical Association for a few months.

I had been invited several times to the orals for candidates for the master's degree. Knowing that private colleges and universities do not fail candidates, I jokingly asked a dean if I could vote **FAILED** to the candidate. She answered me very politely, "We should help and guide the candidate to enable her to secure her master's degree." After that incident, I declined to accept invitations like that even considering that for each examination, the reward is twenty pesos or perhaps a "barong." I received no more invitation from that dean perhaps because I gave her embarrassment.

At the University of the Philippines a move had been started a few years ago giving the master's degree in some courses to those who were willing to take extra graduate credits, say, six to twelve instead of the thesis. Some universities, I believe, would follow the U.P. example, and I agree with it. More teachers would take their master's degree in that way without compunction in their consciences. I learned from a private school superintendent that in a few years, no one may be appointed high school principal without a master's degree.

Research could be very hard for a beginner, and it is also very taxing. My experiences as researcher in the Library of Congress, the largest in the New World, were very pleasant and entertaining.[7] I consulted a desk assistant who was willing to help me. I told him I had a problem and I gave him my topic. Upon learning it, he looked around and found a list of books related to my topic. He told me to select the books I wanted, and I did. After about fifteen or twenty minutes, he came back with all the books I checked except one. I chose a carel where I worked for several weeks and I successfully completed my undertaking.

Even here in our country research might be as enjoyable if one had the patience. He goes to the National Library, and other libraries like those of Santo Tomas, Far Eastern or University of the East, perhaps, the Lopez collection which is now very extensive. For sometime, the researcher may not find what he wants, but one day, he makes a discovery and discovery is very exciting to anybody. The discovery might lead him to make more research. He finds a working bibliography, and makes a success of his work. Today, employees in general are becoming helpful unlike before martial law was proclaimed. The present admonition is producing good results. *Upang umunlad ang bayan disiplina ang kailangan.* And we have to admit that we Filipinos have no national discipline, but we must learn if we expect to have a new society. Our martial law is producing plenty of good results.

---

[7] The lecturer spent his sabatical leave from the University of the Philippines at Washington, D. C. (1953-1954). Upon his return to our country, he brought with him a photostat copy of Taylor's *Insurgent Records* now in the University Library. Before 1954 no Filipino had a copy of those records in the Philippines.

The process I described as *synthesis* is the more important aspect of historiography and may not be described briefly. It could, however, be boiled down to the following steps: (1) the selection of a topic; (2) the gathering of source materials and the preparation of a tentative bibliography; (3) the taking of notes on selected documents; (4) the organization of data and the making of an outline; (5) the writing of the composition or theme constituting the subject matter of the investigation; and (6) the revising and rewriting of the manuscript in final form including its documentation, that is to say, footnotes and final bibliography.

As may be seen from the preceding paragraph, the first step is the selection of a topic for investigation. In doing this care should be taken that it is not broad nor vague. It should be something within the power of the searcher to accomplish, and this depends upon his interests and abilities, the time allotment and the sources available in town and nearby communities. It is better to err on the side of being too little rather than too much, In number of typewritten pages, a thesis should not exceed 300 pages.

The second step is the gathering of source materials, primary, secondary, or sources to the nth degree, and its difficulties has been explained. The patient researcher, however, generally succeeds if he is very insistent on doing his work. Those who have obtained the doctorate degree had successfully undergone the hard and intricate processes so that they could write more books thereafter if they wanted to.[8]

Students have been given instructions on how to take notes. Using the 3 x 5-inch cards, he enters data as prescribed in the guides. Take notes on 5 x 8-inch cards or its substitute since cards of this type are rather expensive. The bond paper 8 1/2 x 11 inches could be cut widthwise, and its size is almost the same as the 5 x 8 cards. Students are advised to do this than use notebooks which are inconvenient for shifting purposes. They are likewise warned to take the exact pages whence notes have been taken. Of great importance are the "exact words" in quotations which may be needed in documentations.

The steps that have been taken are but preliminary to the *synthesis* (historiography proper)—the organization of data, and the preparation of an outline; the writing of the composition; and the revising and rewriting in final form of the manuscript. In the final stages all the talents of the "historian" come into play, and it is on these bases that he is judged by scholars. I had pointed out that facts of history are the same. It is on the interpretations and commentaries of the writer that his scholarship is revealed. It is easy enough to catalogue facts. Almost anybody can do that, but to judge and interpret events and social phenomena is another matter.

A good writer believes that Filipino historians should rewrite Philippine history and interpret facts from the point of view of Filipinos. They should utilize our "good past" to promote our national ambitions.[9] In his book Herbert F. Muller quotes Croce's principles that history is always contemporary; history is 'for the occasion' of what is alive for us; the past keeps changing with the present. Every age has to rewrite its history, recreate the past; in every age a different Christ dies on the Cross, and is resurrected to a different end . . . Our task is to create a 'usable past' for our living purposes.[10]

---

[8] The late Professor of history Dr. Honesto A. Villanueva informed me that it took him almost twenty years to get his degree because he was a self-supporting student in the University of California.

[9] Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *Our Usable Past,* International Conference of Asian History, November 25-30, 1960.

The main steps in historiography have been presented briefly. Just a few more words on the writing of history may be added. Historians should present their subject matter in an interesting manner, better yet in literary language. The greatest historians were interesting storytellers. Herodotus, Thucydides, Gibbon, Macaulay, to mention only a few, possess those qualities. Macaulay in particular was literary and that seems to be the aim of some of our colleagues in history writing. It is possible that one of them might succeed in that great ambition.

The writing, revising and rewriting of history manuscripts based on a prepared outline requires much talent and skill. Not everyone possesses the ability to write well, and that unfortunately is the handicap of most of us. Some of you may have read some of my writings, and I am not quite satisfied with my performance, but I try and try again. I have requested a good number of friends to help me, and I am very grateful to all those who helped and advised me on matters of importance.

The late Rex D. Drilon who died as president of the Central Philippine University at Iloilo gave me great aid whenever I consulted him. Professors Esteban A. de Ocampo, Leopoldo R. Serrano, Celedonio Ancheta and others came to my assistance quite often. Dr. Encarnacion Alzona encouraged me to do more writing like other colleagues. And I am not ashamed to ask for help. I understand that even the genius Winston Churchill needed help while writing. In the next school year when I resume my teaching, I could invite fellow teachers to come to our house at 92 Sgt. Catolos Street, Cubao, Quezon City, so that they could see specimen in my writing gone over by fellow-teachers and professors of history. It is very easy to see that writing means rewriting, rewriting, rewriting.

And scholarship seems to be the most important basis for appointment and promotion in American universities. That was true also in Canada, and Scandinavia, and very likely in other parts of the world. The highest paid professors are those who have written great works in history, specially those who had been granted important awards for scholarships. Great classroom teachers are at times recognized but scholarship remains the outstanding achievement world-widely recognized. There are teachers and professors in many universities who do not even know how to teach.

---

[10] Herbert F. Muller, *Uses of the Past*, p. 33 et al.

When I entered the University of the Philippines, it was my desire to do my major work in English because I had an ambition to become a sort of a writer. Unfortunately, my teacher in English, a graduate of a famous American university, did not know how to teach, and I changed my major to history because Leandro H. Fernandez, my instructor, was a wonderful teacher.

Dr. Encarnacion Alzona, one of my professors, used to say that teachers are born like mathematicians and poets. She continued saying that teaching could not be taught contrary to the ideas of the late Dean Francisco Benitez, founder of the U. P. College of Education.[11] Leandro H. Fernandez who died as dean of the U. P. College of Liberal Arts said that learning methods of teaching are unnecessary. All that was needed is mastery of subject matter on his theory that one who knows his subject very well would find the ways and means of delivering the goods. According to Dr. Dalmacio Martin teachers of history remain poor teachers since they emphasize names of persons, dates and events. They fail to explain the modern methods of teaching history.

Another reason for poor teaching of history is the fact that lawyers, doctors of medicine, newspaper reporters and other professionals teach history in college. That is because the Bureau of Private Schools is not strict in preventing such anomaly. It is even believed that anyone who can read could teach history.

Some Filipinos are probably born historians. During the Spanish regime we recognized Dr. T. H. Pardo de Tavera as our greatest scholar, yet he was a doctor of medicine and a politician. There was Don Epifanio de los Santos who was a lawyer and a stateman. Highway 54 is now called by his name because of his talent as a historian. There was Manuel Artigas who described the events of 1872 very clearly. Mariano Ponce, the close associate of Marcelo H. del Pilar in editing *La Solidaridad*, proved himself a historian-librarian. Today, Dr. Domingo Abella, is recognized in eastern Asia as a historian, and he deserves his assignment as archivist of the National Archives. There is Carlos Quirino who has been writing good biographies of our national heroes, but his line is geography.

---

[11] Encarnacion Alzona, "The Education of the Filipino Teacher of History" *Historical Bulletin*, December 1958, pp. 97 ff.

I do not quite agree with Dr. Alzona and Dr. Fernandez that teaching should not be taught. It might be good for those who are born teachers, but thousands of history teachers are not born; hence, they should be taught how to teach.

I used to think that priests who are deeply involved in religious matters could not become good historians, yet there is Father Horacio de la Costa now working with the Pope in Rome. His historical accounts are very scholarly written, following the saying of a Recollect historian: "Give unto history what belongs to history, and to God what pertains to God."

As I close, please take note that the mastery of historiography is good for teachers of history. I have already intimated that the writing of history is one way of exemplifying a knowledge of its intricacies. It could actually be a very good tool to promote the understanding of history.

New Dimensions for Historical Studies*

Celedonio O. Resurrección

IF MOTHER Shipton, Alfred Lord Tennyson and Monsieur Jules Verne were alive today, got together and compared notes, they would have pretty good reason to feel much pleased. All their visions have come true in our time.

Mother Shipton was a clairvoyant of the seventeenth century who prophesied that Britain "would one day be criss-crossed with iron rods."[1] Lord Tennyson was the poet laureate of Victorian England who foresaw in *Locksley Hall* the horrors of aerial warfare.

> *For I dipped into the future, far as human eye could see,*
> *Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;*
> *Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew,*
> *From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue.*[2]

Monsieur Verne was a frustrated French lawyer of the late nineteenth century. To make a living he wrote fiction, among which was a description of a trip to the moon by rocket and an undersea adventure of a watercraft called Nautilus. Their visions are no longer figments of the imagination.

---

* Lecture delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the National Historical Commission held at the University of San Carlos, Cebu City, on Sept. 23, 1973.

[1] Quoted by Michael Swann in Mitchison, *What the Human Race Is Up To?*, page 258.

[2] M. H. Abrams, et al., *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, page 743.

The achievements of man in our time stagger the imagination. The Dutch scholar G. T. Renier suggested that people must at times "stop to think."[3] I believe that the time has really come for us to call a recess from our preoccupations and begin to enjoy the idle but fruitful luxury of "stopping to think" about the human condition in contemporary times. We recall, as of relevance, Socrates' sound advice in Plato's *Apologia,* "An unexamined life is not worth living." No time is more appropriate for study than the present. John McHale's thematic epigraph comes to mind:

> *The future of the past is in the future*
> *The future of the present is in the past*
> *The future of the future is in the present.*[4]

These are no mere play of words. Each statement is pregnant with meaning and has been used as approach in McHale's study of the present.[5]

This paper purports, then, to present certain aspects of the contemporary world, with focus on the new dimensions for historical studies. By the term "historical studies" I mean historical research, historical inquiry, history as a form of thought. As to the term "new dimensions" I have surrendered to an inner compulsion to employ it in the sense of "vital dimensions" of human events. This identity may be justified by the concept of history as requiring that the narrated human events be definite in time and place, social in nature, and socially meaningful, in other words, vitally significant.[6]

The second half of the twentieth century is an age of achievement. In the natural sciences, in philosophy and metaphysics, in the social sciences, and in the liberal arts, man has ascended fast during the last two decades. His achievements in the bio-sciences, medicine, nutrition, health and sanitation, in physics and chemistry, genetics, transportation, communications, construction and many others have made life materially satisfying with its stronger fabric and finer texture than it was a hundred years ago.

---

[3] *History,* page 2. See also footnote 1, same page.

[4] See epigraph, n. p., in *The Future of the Future.*

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 1; See also Garraghan, *A Guide To Historical Method;* p. 11.

Already some people have started harnessing present resources in optimistic anticipation of the future, especially in the underdeveloped or developing countries which are undergoing a "revolution of rising expectations." A Committee on the Year 2000 led by Daniel Bell was commissioned by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences to draw up various potential futures.[7] A group called the New Utopians[8] has concerned itself with developing potentials of computer programming in business and industry. There is a noticeable growing interest in a "useful search for a future."[9] What we need is a "search for a useful future."[10]

Meanwhile, scholars, observers and concerned world citizens have noted that the ascent of man has been slowing down.[11] The path of progress has apparently met an invisible obstacle, and changed its direction, following a pattern of what mathematical analysts call the exponential curve.

The exponential growth curve initially rises fast, concave from the points of origin, then bends over to the opposite direction, as if deflected, losing momentum in the course, and flattens to zero marginal gain before it plunges downward in an "S-shaped" curve. The whole phenomenon is algebraically expressed by the formula:[12]

$$Y=a + bX + cX^2 + dX^3$$

where Y stands for growth output, X for input, and a, b, c and d for the parameters.

Syndromes of a declining world civilization have set in, awaiting evaluation by historical researchers. We who have the good fortune of living since the antebellum years are, in the language of advocates of the court, *res gestae* witnesses to the barbarization of specialization, the trivialization of human life, the rape and plunder of our planet, the alienation of man, the growing anomie and disorganization of society, the death of cities, the eutrophication of bodies of water, the desfoliation of our forests, and many others.

---

[7] Marty, *The Search for a Usable Future*, p. 27.

[8] Boguslaw, *The New Utopians*, p. 7.

[9] Marty, *loc. cit.*, 26-40.

[10] Among those engaged in this kind of search is Bertrand de Jouvenel and his *Futuribles* in France.

[11] Chase, *The Most Probable World*, p. 18.

[12] Heady, *Economics of Agricultural Production and Resource Use*, p. 39

The crisis of our time was correctly anticipated by Pitirim A. Sorokin, a social philosopher:

> In accordance with the prognosis of the Crisis, the central process for the last few decades has consisted in: a) a progressive decay of sensate culture, society, and man, and b) in an emergence and slow growth of the first components of the new—ideational or idealistic—sociocultural order.
>
> In science this double process has manifested itself in a) the mentioned increasing destructiveness of the morally irresponsible, sensate scientific achievements, and b) in a transformation of the basic theories of science in a morally responsible, ideational or idealistic direction.
>
> In the *field of philosophy* this double process has manifested itself in increasing sterility and decline of recent materialistic, mechanistic, "positivistic," and other sensate philosophies and in the emergence and growth of "the Existential," "the Intuitive," "the Neo-Tnomist," and other philosophies congenial to the basic principles of Ideationalism or Idealism.
>
> A similar double process has been going on in all fields of *fine* arts.
>
> In the realm of religion it has shown itself in the simultaneous growth of: a) militant atheism and b) religious revival.
>
> In *ethics* it has called forth: a) utter bestiality and horrible demoralization shown in the Second World War, bloody revolutions, and increasing criminality, and b) growth of moral heroism, sublime altruism, and organized movements for abolition of war, bloody strike, and injustice.
>
> In *politics* the double process has resulted: a) in proliferation of all kinds of tyrannisal dictatorships, and b) in the slowly swelling grass-roots movements for establishments of a competent, honest, and morally responsible government of the people, by the people, and for the people.[13]

Evidently man has begun a process of subjugation by his own achievements, a captive-slave of his own milieu. This is one of the riddles of history: the paradox of man conquering and dominating nature on one hand and, on the other, his enslavement by his achievements. There is something Hegelian to it, some observable antithetical conflict of invisible social forces.

---

[13] Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age.* Foreword, n. p.

We are, it seems, approaching a point where the past is not usable any more. We are reaching a stage where we are captives of our modern contraptions, innocent victims of our making. Hope for escape draws us away from the shadow of of the past and leads us toward the big refuge of hope—the Future.

When the past becomes "voiceless to a generation that needed a voice,"[14] and the future is the only hope, human powers are self-propelled toward the direction of hope. In such event, as well put by McHale, "questions regarding the human condition need no longer be phrased in terms of what we *can* do, but in terms of what we *choose* to do."[15] We find in this situation a new role for historians, and that is: making use of nascent social forces to expose the latent potentialities of a usable future.

We are now ready to confront a fundamental question. What are the events of today that provide new dimensions to the emerging historiography? These are the events that will influence the shape of the future. As stated earlier, "the future of the future is in the present." It is therefore in the present that historians must look to for their materials. Whether we like it or not, our lives are beginning to feel the stress of technology, population explosion, computerization, lunar exploration, ecological crisis, dehumanization of art and culture, human alienation. The future as history will depend largely on how contemporary society will regard these problematic dimensions of life, how it will attempt to solve them. Unless society controls its future, the future will control society.

Consider population as a new dimension for historical studies. The central fact of the middle of the twentieth century is the explosive growth of the human population. Spaceship Earth is loaded beyond its capacity with 3.5 billion passengers on board. This load increases every year by seventy million. When population growth rides high, the four horsemen of our apocalyptic age also ride high with it. They are hunger, poverty, ignorance, and disease.[16]

---

[14] Marty, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
[15] McHale, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

The profile of the earth will never be the same again. The world's exploding population has changed and will continue to change public policy by way of adjustment. Some authorities[17] say that from the population point of view, the key issues are food, jobs and schools. These are too simplistic, they hide a great deal of reality.

In the political area, for example, the population profile affects the quality of legislation, the policy of recruitment for national defense, the attitude toward population mobility as well as social movements, the formation of well-defined organizations at the local levels of government.

In the field of social policy, population growth influences the rate of urbanization, the difficulty or ease of social equalization, the restructuring of the educational system and provisioning of educational facilities, the institution of housing programs, the adoption of social security and welfare plans, the growth of transportation, communications, construction, banking and finance, power and fuel industries, the proliferation of the media, production of food supply, the raising of health and sanitation standards, the solving of moral problems arising from overpopulation, such as abortion and infanticide, the combat of general poverty and disease, family planning, and others.

In the field of economic policy, the size and quality of the population affect the size and quality of the labor supply, of production, of consumption, of capital formation, and of the standard and level of living, as well as the national policy with respect to immigrant labor.[18],

There exists a palpable correlation between the human condition and the history of the people. The situation in which we find ourselves today yields myriads of raw materials for analyses and syntheses by interpreters of our immediate past and the contemporary world. Current history is being studied in an effort at knowing how to change the direction of progress so that man will have a usable future. In the more rhetorical language of Marty, "To speak of the sense of a useless past, then, is not to take a nihilist's view of historical life but rather to point to the creative possibility of the moment."[19]

---

[16] Hoffman, *World Without Want*, Chapter I. See also McCormack, *The Population Explosion and World Hunger*, pp. 12-25.

[17] Regudo and Murphy, "The Philippine Population in the Seventies" in Concepcion, *Philippine Population in the Seventies*, p. 16.

[18] Gitlow, *Labor Economics and Industrial Relations*, p. 11 ff.; and *Labor and Industrial Society*, pp. 537-539.

Thus, historians assist, directly or indirectly, in policy formulation, in redirecting the course of human events. That this role of historians has become not only necessary but also imperative, possibly a *sine qua non* for the preservation of mankind and therefore of human civilization, will be more greatly appreciated from the following observations of a famous bio-scientist:

> The people of the UDC [underdeveloped countries] will be unable to escape from poverty and misery unless their populations are controlled. Today these countries have larger populations than they can properly support, given their physical and biological resources. Furthermore, their population growth rates make it clear that conditions are going to get steadily and rapidly worse. The populations of most UDCs are doubling every 20-30 years. There would be nearly twice as many families in 20 years; today's children would be adults and have their own children. In order to maintain present living standards, such a country must, in two decades, duplicate every amenity for the support of human beings. Where there is one home today there must be two (or their equivalent). Where there is one hospital, garage, judge, doctor, or mechanic, there must be two. Agricultural production must be doubled. Imports and exports must be doubled. The capacity of roads, water systems, electric generating plants, and so on must be doubled. It is problematical whether the United States could accomplish a doubling of its facilities in 20 years and yet the United States has abundant capital, the world's finest industrial base, rich natural resources, excellent communications, and a population virtually 100 percent literate. The Philippines, Honduras, and other UDCs have none of these things. They are not even going to be able to maintain their present low standards of living.[20]

Another vital dimension for historical study is the social effect of pollution. Pollution *per se* is nonhuman, hence nonsocial. But it is socially significant in the sense that it is caused by man and its consequences affect mankind.

---

[19] Marty, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

[20] Ehrlich and Ehrlich, *Population, Resources, Environment*, p. 2.

Pollution is an element in the dialectics of progress. We desire economic development; we plan and carry out a program of industrialization. We pour investments into infrastructure projects. But we have not planned enough to guard against the dangers of pollution. Unless we have the foresight to install preventive or corrective measures, pollution is the price we pay for industrialization and progress.

The population explosion and development technology have shrunk and shrivelled our world. As McLuhan, a Canadian sociologist, has well put it, technology has converted the globe into a village.[21] The whole globe has become man's dumping ground, and we have only a "standing space"[22] in our crowded planet.

Stuart Chase has listed[23] eight assaults on our living space: (1) air pollutants. (2) nuclear fallout; (3) contrails of supersonic airlines; (4) noise; (5) water pollutants; (6) water supply; (7) land pollutants; and (8) outer space pollutant. It must be noted that man is the agent of all, except the last.

Air pollutants cause the formation of smog. A combination of smog and "temperature inversion," a condition where hot air does not rise and fade away, can cause mass death. Thus, in 1952 twelve thousand Londoners were reported to have been killed by this lethal inversion-pollution combination.[24]

Noise is a special type of air pollutant.[25] Robert Alex Brown in his book *The Tyranny of Noise*[26] describes the injurious effects of noise as pollutant upon health and the quality of environment.

Pollution could cause not only the death of individuals. It could also kill cities, nations, and the like. New York is one such dying city. It dies because it is killing itself through people who have no sense of quiet. If and when this happens on a wider scale, history will have changed, and historians will have something to think about.

---

[21] McLuhan, *Understanding Media*, p. 20.
[22] Sax, *Standing Space, passim.*
[23] Chase, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-70.
[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 59-60.
[25] The ordinary concept of *pollutant* is any foreign body that renders something unclean, impure, contaminated.
[26] Harper (Colophon Books), chapter. 2.

Attention is invited to the latest issue of the USIS publication, *Dialogue*, (Vol. 6, No. 1, 1973), which carries several critical essays on "The Limits of Growth." This is a computer-based study prepared at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, using as historical base the trends from 1900 to 1970 and employing the "systems dynamics" method of computer modeling to study the complex and interlocking global trends as a system. For lack of space and perhaps propriety, only the concluding remarks of one contributor, Robert L. Heilbroner, economic historian, is here quoted. He says:

> Our generation is unlikely to solve the technical problems that will guarantee the indefinite viability of the planet, and will surely not solve the social challenges that are indissolubly associated with mankind's survival. But in the startled recognition that an ultimate ecological problem exists, it can set the stage for more decisive action by generations to follow.[27]

This is the same as saying that man must decide his destiny. Whatever decisions he will ultimately adopt and pursue will shape the course of history. It is these decisions, however seemingly impalpable and imperceptible for the moment, that contemporary historians should attempt to recapture to serve as dimensions for their historical interpretation of the present toward a meaningful, usable future.

In the Philippine setting, ecological conditions and environmental changes suggest the future course of historical development. The harmonious balance between man and his environment is being increasingly disturbed, remotely or proximately, by overpopulation. The result may be man's own destruction and not unlikely the annihilation of living things in the biosphere.

Alvarez[28] reports that the International Commission of National Parks, International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, undertook a Southeast Asian survey in the Philippines to evaluate the status of its resources. The findings were shocking:

---

[27] *Dialogue*, page 12.

[28] "Pollution," *The Fookien Times Yearbook 1972*, p. 222 and ff.

1. There is an alarming rate of population growth — 3,000 babies born every day.

2. Each day 3,000 more people require water from the watersheds, demand products from forest resources, require food from the soil resources.

3. From available sources, 80% of the forest areas have already been destroyed since the end of World War II.

4. In Western Mindanao, which covers roughly 10% of the country's forest resources, the rate of deforestation during th past eleven years is more than 20,000 hectares per year.

5. Unplanned capital formation with an eye to development and progress has led to extensive deterioration of natural resources by wanton disposal of industrial wastes and other pollutants.

6. On dust alone, pollution reaches the unbelievable degree of thirty-two tons per square mile per month.

7. In 1955 air pollutants in the Philippines could be seen by air pilots at 2,000 feet only. Today they can be seen at an altitude of 5,000 feet.

8. Water pollution results in the death of aquatic life as a result of the draining of deleterious industrial wastes, oils and gasoline into lakes and rivers. The National Water and Air Pollution Control Commission of the Philippines reported that the Pasig River received more than 11 million gallons of organic wastes every day from industries alone. Pasig River is polluted also by sewage. The sewered population of Great Metropolitan Manila discharge 165,000 gallons of refuse every day into the Pasig, and the unsewered population, about 1,072,000 gallons a day, while the public toilets contribute 239,000 gallons a day. To these pollutants should be added the solid wastes and liquid discharges from about 66,500 estero-squatters. It would not be surprising if a similar process of pollution was taking place in other cities and municipalities.

Besides the demographic and the ecological revolutions, a computer or automation revolution is also taking place. Also called cybernetics, automation has been changing the role of man in business and industry and has affected both the tempo and quality of life.

What is new in automation is its principle of feedback.[29] Feedback is a device by which machines control their own operation such that production does not have to account for human failings and limitations. It is self-controlling, self-correcting, self-steering.

The social, as well as economic, effect of automation is changing the complexion of social history. Mankind enjoys its blessings, but it also dreads its dangers.

An economist of note predicted the collapse of the socioeconomic system with the increased adoption of automation and feared the appearance of the spectre of permanent unemployment.[30] In fact, automation has bumped off the blue-collar workers from the payroll and has started pushing out the white-collar employees.[31]

Automation creates a "New Priesthood," borrowing Lapp's picturesque description. The group consists of an elite of scientists dominating society by usurping traditional roles of democratic decision-formulation and even usurping managerial functions.[33]

In terms of human survival, automation makes it imperative to effect immediate overhaul of the entire educational system.[34]

With automation, says a leading Canadian sociologist Marshall McLuhan, "it is not only jobs that disappear and complex roles that reappear. . . . Automation is information and it not only ends jobs in the world of work, it ends subjects in the world of learning. It does not end the world of learning. The future of work consists of learning a living in the automation age."[35]

While perceptive scholars, like Boguslaw, feel that computers and automation have absorbed the attention of mankind, setting aside the contemporary social scientists, they also believe that the revolution of modernity is more than material or intellectual revolution.

---

[29] Chase, *op. cit.*, p. 120.
[30] Robert Theobald, cited by Boguslaw, p. 24.
[31] Lapp, *The New Priesthood*, p. 8.
[32] Seeman, Cited by Boguslaw, p. 25.
[33] Lapp, *loc. cit.*, pages 3 and 221 ff.
[34] Boguslaw, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
[35] McLuhan, *op. cit.*, pp. 300-301.

> ...as its crowning symbol, it developed a radically new outlook on human destiny, which saw the meaning of history in terms of the progress of the human mind, and held that human history could be made to follow the direction that men chose to give it. ...It is a unique venture in human affairs, and we can only relieve the strains and tensions it has created by taking it seriously. Our disappointments are real. But they are real because our powers are great and our expectations legitimately high.[36]

These remarks are as relevant to us as they are to any other people.

Human culture is regarded as a process of man's progressive liberation.[37] In the process he discovers the power to build up a world of his own — a human universe that synthesizes and sums up his changed and continually changing philosophy of life.

Thus have we arrived to regard the **New Society** of ours. We do not merely float with the currents of the time. We sail, and we sail because we believe in our goals and objectives as a people reborn. We sail, we do not drift but we sail, because we believe in a sense of direction, we believe in purposive action, we desire a better future.

The three revolutions just discussed have begotten the academic revolution, which calls for corrective and adaptive courses of study in order to enable man to cope with the new style of life and survive.

The demographic revolution calls for an understanding of the genetic process and an appreciation of man's relation to his environment as one of harmonious balance within certain tolerable limits. The moment that the land-man ratio is disturbed, the lid of Pandora's box is opened and mankind suffers from a pestilence of misfortunes. Education along demography should emphasize family planning if levels of living were to improve.

The ecological revolution is a by-product of over-population and an obsession to attain economic development through industrialization. Not only do we witness expanding urbanization but we also suffer from man's thoughtlessness by means of improper disposal of pollutants that destroy the biosphere. "Technological innovations are regularly introduced for the sake of technological convenience, and without established mechanisms for appraising or controlling or even cushioning their consequences."[38]

---

[36] Boguslaw, *op. cit.*, p. v.
[37] Frankel, *The Case for Modern Man*, pp. 208-209.

Education in conservation of the physical environment has become an imperative for survival to prevent extinction of the human race and all traces of life on earth. We need to resolve three broad problems to save the great advances in our civilization: 1) to survey what have been lost through environment destruction; 2) to determine feasibility of restitution of the losses; and 3) to set down the requirements for a new approach to harmonizing man with nature consistent with the reality and in practical terms.[39]

The computer revolution requires educational retraining of displaced workers and the development of manpower according to the manpower needs of the new technology. Computer or automation technology requires an entirely new skill and new knowledge different from the traditional and classical. The proper educational approach should be geared to computer designing, programming, repairing and maintenance, and interpreting.

The Philippines has not yet attained a sufficient degree of computerization. But this phenomenon is sure to come. In fact, it is already with us in its incipient stage. Its threat should be considered in the formulation of national policy on education.

In politics the democratic revolution is adding another new dimension to historical writing. The twenty-first day of September 1972 is definitely a historic landmark. It gave birth of the New Society. The new social order means national renewal for national survival. It calls for dignified existence and for a truly humanistic approach to governance.

---

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 198.

[39] Nicholson, *The Environmental Revolution*, pp. 18-19.

It calls for unity, the closing of ranks with those who feel alienated.

For in truth there appears to be no fundamental ideological difference between Christian humanism and Marxist or socialist humanism.[40] All Humanists share a belief in the unity of humanity under the doctrine of universal brotherhood. They have faith in the future of man because they believe in the perfectibility of human powers. They emerged and keep on re-emerging as a reaction to any and all threats to mankind. They believe in the full development of the individual as the condition *sine qua non* for the full development of society.

That is why the New Society is a historic landmark because it is founded on humanistic ideals and objectives. Historians of contemporary Philippines will soon be writing of the salutary change ushered in by the New Society. They will be analyzing its nature, its cause and effect. Likewise, history teachers will soon be teaching, if they are not teaching yet, the significance of the great change about us.

I have initially given a portrait of the second half of the twentieth century as a century of revolutions. I tried to maintain that history is not only an "unending dialogue between the present and the past"; it is also a stream of consciousness between the present and the future. While inferentially admitting that we need to search for a usable past with the future as beneficiary, I argued that we need also to search for a usable future.

To the question, "what are the events of today that provide new dimensions to the emerging historiography " I hazarded the following answers:

1. The **demographic revolution**, in the form of population explosion, which has implications in policy formulation covering broad areas — political, social and economic.
2. The **ecological revolution,** with its attendant problem of pollution that threatens all forms of life on earth, thus affecting the content of history.

---

[40] Fromm, *Socialist Humanism, passim.*

3. The **computer or automation,** also called cybernetic revolution, which is altering the uses of human beings, the texture of life in an advancing technological society under the "New Priesthood" of expert men of science.

4. The **academic revolution** which is a logical outgrowth of the demographic, ecological, and computer revolutions as a means of meeting or at least cushioning their consequences.

5. The **democratic revolution** in the Philippines, which has established the New Society.

The five revolutions are the five dimensions of the emerging historiography vis-a-vis the Philippines. These new dimensions are vital dimensions in the sense that they all affect human life, its tone and fabric, its prospect and progress.

EPILOGUE: HISTORIANS IN THE NEW SOCIETY

A world statesman once remarked: "Historians are dangerous people. They are capable of upsetting anything. They must be directed."[41] What he really meant is that historians wield tremendous power in their pen — the power to influence the mind of leaders and people and consequently the course of history. Properly exercised, this power can bring in the trade winds of progress. When the trade winds come, can the rich argosies be far behind? But when this power of historians is misused or abused, it can generate hurricanes to wreak destruction in their wake.

The goal of the New Society is progression. Any retrogression to the old order, to the old ways and habits, is anathema. Historians and history teachers must educate their students and readers towards those values that would make them feel proud of their past and of their heroes. They have the power to historicize. They have the power to rebuild our world. They have the power and responsibility to preserve the viability of the New Society and make it enduring for all time to come.

---

[41] N. Khruschev, quoted by Sturley, *The Study of History*, p. 18.

The Relevance of the Past*

Celedonio O. Resurrección

In a sense, to be a historian is to be a dreamer, that is, an intelligent dreamer. He builds dreamworlds, one after another, onto which he hies himself to forget some nagging heartaches of his profession and possibly the harshness of the realities of life.

Today I have come as a dreamer. I dream of the relevance of the past. For us in the academic world, what could be a better subject for reflection in this time of multifarious crises?

I invite you all, then, to dream with me. Let us dream together and share with each other the experience of wandering into the Elysian woodlands of yesteryears. Let us allow ourselves to get lost in the timeless moments of bygone days. "History," the poet T. S. Eliot reminds us, "is a pattern of timeless moments."[1]

And now we begin to dream.

To argue for the relevance of the past is, paradoxically, to admit its irrelevance, for one cannot plead for a cause except against its opposite. Whether the past is relevant or not depends largely on what side of the fence one belongs. Even the fence-sitters provide a third point of view. In short, three major schools of thought regarding the relevancy of the past are recognizable.

---

* Paper read in the First Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at the Bicol University, Legaspi City, on August 28, 1971.

[1] Quoted by Alan Donagan and Barbara Donagan, *Philosophy of History* (New York: Macmillan, 1965), p. 1.

One school holds that the past has uses.[2] History, it asserts, gives us a clear understanding of human motivations, actions, and responses.[3] Given a similar situation in the present, we shall know what pitfalls to avoid, what precautions to take, what results to expect, what virtues to emulate, what vices to get ourselves rid off—in sum, what lessons to remember.

At the other extreme, there is the nihilist school,[4] that thinks of the past in negative terms. The past, it contends, is totally irrelevant to the living generation that is seeking self-fulfillment, whose social concern strips them of all sense of historical consciousness. This is the generation[5] that cares not to look back because it sees nothing, it finds nothing, in the past. It fails to find anything in it not because it has lost its meaning—for the past has essentially no meaning—but because its insuperable obsession is the future of society. This is the generation to whom the past "was voiceless to a generation that needed a voice."[6]

There is a middle-of-the-road school, the school that treats history as a weakling, impotent to dialogue directly with the present. Those who assume this posture, however, have the skill and the power to convert historical disutility into utility. History is given a new light, a new interpretation, a new coat tailored to the needs and purposes of existing political authority. This school can impart relevance to an otherwise irrelevant past. Thus considered, history is not a dynamo, not a source of energy. Rather, it is the historians and policy-makers,[7] too, who are wielders of power. Was not the meaning of Nikita Khrushchev clear when he said that "historians are dangerous people. They are capable of upsetting everything. They must be directed."[8] This school would focus attention to the creative potentiality of the present from which historians look backward with a kind of compensatory visionarism in order to build a new society and establish a new order, a new caesarism.

---

[2] Herbert J. Muller, *The Uses of the Past* (Oxford University Press, Inc., 1952), *passim;* Henry Steele Commager, "The Search for a Usable Past," *American Heritage,* XVI:2, (February, 1965).

[3] Alfred J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, Abridgment by D. C. Sommervell (London: Oxford University, 1960), p. 67.

[4] Not to be confused with historical nihilism, the view that generalization has no place whatsoever in history. See Carey B. Joynt and Nicholas Rescher "The Problem of Uniqueness in History," *Studies in the Philosophy of History,* ed. by George H. Nadel (New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper & Row, 1965), p. 8.

[5] The generation includes Marshall Mcluhan, Sonia Sontag, Tom Wolfe, LeRoi Jones, Allen Ginsberg, and I think Paul Sartre.

[6] *Ibid.*

I have no inclination of sharing room with this third group of manipulators of history to serve political ends. Their betrayal of history is infuratingly intolerable. Their voluntary and deliberate distortion of truth is treason against the sovereignty of Clio, muse of historians. Their attempt to historize—or is it de-historize?—the past reflects a failure to grasp the inexorable march of time. They are myopic to the truism that "*veritas filia temporis*"—time reveals the truth,[9] which has the standing of a tradition.

The second group composed of nihilists is annoyingly disagreeable for its myopic approach. It would want us to believe in a barrenness of sensate experience in a sensate world.[10] They have no power of circumspection. In denying the value of the past, they ignore historical roots which are integral parts of the historical reality of the present.

The school that espouses the idea of a usable past appears to be the most rational and acceptable. Some erratic souls may rant about the irrelevance of the relevant past or, inversely, argue against the relevance of the irrelevant past. But such an attitudinizing does not and cannot strip the past of its usableness. Nonuse cannot remove the mantle of utility from the past. Nor can abusage rob it of its essential goodness.

---

[7] John Maynard Keynes in his *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* made mentions of madmen in history, who are also included in this category of policy-makers.

[8] Quoted by D. M. Sturley, *The Study of History* (London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1969), p. 18.

[9] See the essay of Fritz Saxl on the same subject in *Philosophy and History*, essays presented to Ernst Cassirer, edited by Raymond Klibansky and H. J. Paton (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 197 ff.

[10] Pitirim A. Sorokin, *The Basic Trends of Our Time* (New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1964), p. 16 ff.

We have gone quite far without having yet clarified our terms. What do I mean by "relevance of the past"? The great English lexicographer and litterateur, Dr. Samuel Johnson, used to say that "definitions are tricks for pedants." I am no pedant and no trickster. But I am under compulsive urge to play the role of a pedant and perform some tricks. The word *relevance,* from the Latin *relevare,* to lift up, signifies a quality of bearing upon, or applying to, a case in hand; it means pertinence; it suggests logical fitness. Fitness connotes usefulness. Hence in this paper I shall use the terms *relevance* and *uses* interchangeably.

The other trick I am to employ is to equate the word *past* with the word *history.* In the established conceptual language of professional historians, the past is not history, nor history the past. Yet in this paper, I have taken the liberty of using these terms synonymously. By history I do not mean alone the simple past, or the record of actuality: this is not history proper but chronicle. I also refer to historical facts, which are the intelligent, rational, and imaginative reconstruction of the happenings in the past. In summary, then, with "the relevance of the past" I shall posit the idea of "the meaning and uses of history."

Let me now lay down certain assumptions to serve as springboards for further discussion.

First, we assume and agree that history is a study of human experience *in* time and *through* time. We say "in time" because we look at man with a depth perspective of what has gone before; and we say "through time" because the study involves a sense of the inevitability of change, which is an existential constant.

Second, we assume and agree that history is concerned with a perennial search for causes of social phenomena, knowledge of which expands our understanding of the social process. Understanding through history looks backward and forward. George Santayana well articulated the backward linkage when he said that "those who do not know history are doomed to repeat it."[11] Looking forward, history is prologue. This was essentially what Rizal means when he wrote: "To foretell the destiny of a nation it is necessary to open the book that tells of her past."[12]

Third, we asumes and agree that man's experience is individually unique, which accounts for the rich variety of multidimensional historical situations and which gives the lie to the myth that history repeats itself.

Lastly, we assume and agree that history is an intellectual interpretation of the past. "History," Johan Huizinga defines, "is the intellectual form in which a civilization renders account to itself of its past."[13] It is not a mere narrative but a reasoned account of human events worthy of remembrance. In a more elegant phrasing of a practitioner of the historian's profession, "History is a way of making sense of the present by placing it in the context of the past."[14]

Now we are ready for the main menu. What is the relevance of the past? What are the uses of history? This is tantamount to asking, what is the value of historical knowledge?

I should like to begin by stating that historical knowledge has three types of values—professional, social and personal. By professional value I mean exactly what it is—value to the profession, that is, the utility of the knowledge about the historian's craft. The social value appertains to the utilitarian influence of historical knowledge upon peoples, upon society. As the term personal value denotes, it is limited to the improvement of the human personality. These are generalizations. Let me invite you to explore deeper each realm of values.

PERSONAL VALUE

Let us start with personal value. What does a person gain by his knowledge of history? What are the uses of historical knowledge to him?

Every person needs historical knowledge because every man is a historian. Before he acts or makes a decision he leans heavily on what his own experience tells him to be the right thing to do. He does things the way he knows they were done in the past at least within his memory.

---

[12] Jose Rizal, "The Philippines a Century Hence" in *Political and Historical Writings — Jose Rizal,* Vol. VII (Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1964), Centennial Edition, p. 130.

[13] "A Definition of the Concept of History" in Klibansky and Paton, *op. cit.,* p. 69.

[14] Quoted by Sturley, *op. cit.,* p. 16.

When we say, "My teacher used to tell us," or "My father used to tie a knot this way," or "My mother used to cook *kaldereta, kari-kare, pinakbet,* or *guinataan* this way," or "President Quezon used to embrace his political enemies after mercilessly attacking them in his speeches," we are acting as historians by recalling something that happened in the past to guide us in arriving at a decision for action.

When we write letters to friends and relatives about what we witnessed at the bombing of the Liberal Party proclamation rally at Plaza Miranda on August 21, just a week ago, we are recording history for them. When we write a diary of our everyday experience, we are providing materials for future historians. Today we look into the diary of Emily Dickinson to explain away her emotional verbalizations in her exquisite poems; we study the diary of Anne Franck to gain an insight into the condition of life in wartime Germany; we avidly read the memoirs of Albert Speer (*Inside the Third Reich.* New York: Macmillan, 1970) which give a remarkable portrait in depth of Hitler. Our memoirs, diaries, and letters are valuable source materials for historians in the future who will be studying our times.

Another personal value of history is that it enables the individual to understand the present. The present is an extension of the past, just as the future is an extension of the present. To know the present, we must know its background—the forces that helped in providing development, growth and direction to the present.

Before a physician can prescribe a proper remedy, he must first take the personal history of the patient. What has the patient eaten today? How often does he take liquor and in what quantity? Has he been exposed to sudden changes in temperature or in atmospheric pressure? Is there a tradition in the family of Hansen's disease, or of umbilical or inguinal hernia, of diabetes, of cardiac thrill?

Before a lawyer can prepare a brief on behalf of a client, he has to have a series of consultation with the latter on what actually happened. To the lawyer and the court, the brief contains a recital of the history of the case, which will serve as basis of a plea, trial, and perhaps decisions.

Applicants for jobs are historians when they make out their information sheet or curriculum vitae. Bureaucrats are historians when they prepare their reports on projects undertaken or on accomplishments during a given fiscal period.

Teachers are historians when they prepare their reports—any kind of report. Sometimes a teacher is invited to deliver a speech or an address at another school and acts as historian when he reviews the state of education in the country, past and present.

In all kinds of profession, trade or industry, knowledge of the historian's methodology would come in handy and useful. This includes the historian's concern for truth and honesty, for narration and interpretation, for objectivity and tolerance, for stylistic charm and propriety of language. The history student learns all these through constant exposure. Though he be a nonhistorian, he becomes a historian in his mode of thinking, in his approaches to historical problems. This attitude makes of him a better man, an *homo melior* because he is a better *homo sapiens, homo agens, and homo faber.*

Understanding the present is not limited to the immediate and proximate. It applies also to understanding of the social and cultural milieu. No one can presume to know and understand, for example, the "Christian tradition" unless he steeps himself with the rich lore on the spread of Christianity. He must be conversant with the struggle against Islam, the pioneering geographical discoveries and explorations of the 15th, 16th, 17th, and even as late as the 18th centuries, the propagation of the Christian faith to the pagan peoples, the heroic martyrdom of the Christians not only in Europe but also in China and Japan, and the defense of the Christian way of life against the incursions of totalitarianism, fascism and communism.

In the same manner, no one can presume understanding of the social and political ferment of our time unless he is familiar with the cross-currents of ideas. In short, every person needs to know history in order to be able to develop a norm of conduct and aspirations, retaining what is best and discarding what is undesirable in the experience of man. One cannot be a better teacher of government and politics unless he has a good foundation in history, which provides these studies with their roots. One cannot presume to teach economics, management, philosophy, political science, education, mathematics, psychology properly unless he is first introduced into the history of his chosen discipline. Even historians and teachers of history have to study the history of historiography.

Another value of history to the individual is that it is a means to his humanistic development. History is itself great literature. It is the story of mankind. *The Story of Civilization* by Will Durant, for example, is as entertaining and instructive as it is engrossing. It presents a rich and varied tapestry of human achievements, human courage, human conviction and will.

Think of Lapu-lapu telling Magellan's emissary: "Go back and tell the white intruders that if they have swords and helmets of steel, we have bows and arrows of bamboo." It was a defiance that looked like a modern re-enactment of the biblical story of David and Goliath in a Philippine setting.

Or think of the young radja of Manila, Suleiman (or Sulayman), standing on the sandy beach of his fortified city feet astride and arms akimbo, proud and magnificent as a lion, warning the Spaniards: "Remember that we are not *pintados*."

Think of the serenity of countenance shown by Dr. Jose Rizal during his last hours before his martyrdom on Bagumbayan field.

Think of the German Emperor Henry IV who in the dead of winter of the year 1077 A.D. crossed the Alps and for three days stood barefooted in the snow of Canossa waiting for Pope Gregory VII to grant him an audience.

Think of the inspirational background of the builders of temples, of palaces, of monasteries and abbeys, of cities, of libraries and museums, of the creators of music and the arts, of the leaders of men, of storming hordes that disturbed the pax Romanica.

Or think of the intrepid Malay navigators on balsa, without benefit of the astrolabe and other navigational instruments, who sailed through uncharted seas to seek refuge and peace on our shores in settlements called *barangay*.

SOCIAL VALUE

If it is true, as political philosophers tell us, that the state is the individual writ large, then the personal value of historical knowledge becomes a collective value in terms of the political community. Thus we can say that the people themselves are historians in every way; that their knowledge of the past contributes to understanding of the nation's present. But I would underscore two uses of history to society—that of contributing to intelligent citizenship and the other that of appreciating the cultures of other peoples.

Historical knowledge contributes to historical social stability and intelligent citizenship. Historical mindedness inhibits administrators from abusing their powers because they know that persistent unbearable abuses have their critical point of explosion and that a privileged social class that has ceased to be socially serviceable will not be suffered to last longer.

Through historical-mindedness, society develops the power to distinguish the theoretical and practical feasibilities of public policies. It eliminates emotionalism and encourages moderation. "The . . . essential service of history is to restore to man, absorbed in his little concerns of the moment, a sense of due proportion, of the vastness of time, of the slowness of progress, of the transitoriness of so much that is eternal of its own conceit."[15]

Lastly, knowledge of the development of man's thought enables man to know the social role of ideas in history. It has been said over and over again that ideas rule the world. They hold society together and determine its character. Romanticism, Enlightenment, Reformation, Renaissance, Capitalism, Socialism, Nationalism, Mercantilism, Absolutism, Progressivism, Radicalism, and even Anarchism are ideas whose impact on society cannot and should not be underestimated. We of today have our own share of experience of the power of such ideas as state welfarism, Marxism, Maoism, and cooperativism. The ideas of great Filipinos—Jose Rizal, Fathers Burgos, Gomez and Zamora, Marcelo H. del Pilar, Jose Maria Panganiban, Apolinario Mabini, Manuel L. Quezon, Ramon Magsaysay, Claro M. Recto, Rafael Palma, Juan Sumulong, Wenceslao Q. Vinzons, and many others have influenced the tone and texture of Philippine life.

---

[15] Albert Guerard, quoted by Bernard Norling, *Towards a Better Understanding of History* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame, 1960), p. 15.

PROFESSIONAL VALUE

One of the obvious uses of history is that the student who desires to specialize in the historian's profession is led to a discovery that history is not a fable as once remarked by Napoleon, nor a "distillation of rumour" as Thomas Carlyle would describe it, nor "a confused heap of facts" as condemned by Lord Chesterfield. The student finds no confirmation of George Bernard Shaw's contention that "history teaches that history teaches nothing," nor that of Francois Marie Arouet Voltaire's epigram "Happy is the nation without history."[16] [Perhaps, Voltaire would have been correct if he had only said, "*Hereuse est la femme sans une passe.*"—Happy is the woman without a past.]

He who reads history gains an insight into the historian's approaches, his methodology, his tools and techniques, in short, the science of historical research, and above all his scholarship. Along with this discovery the student comes to realize that just as the historian exercises the highest critical analysis and judgment at his command as his faculty and resources would permit, so does the student of history learn to be objective, detached, and intellectually honest. Herbert Butterfield cites Lord Acton's essay on Mary Queen of Scotts which he said was a wealth of bibliographical information, which serves to reflect the amount of omnivorous reading and depth of reflection made by the author.[17]

---

[16] All quotations from Sturley, *op. cit.*

True, there were uncomplimentary remarks on history by well-known commentators and writers in the 18th century and earlier. But these were caused by the tardy development of historicism, which is "the term applied to attempts to take a comprehensive view of the entire historical process and by systematizing it, by revealing patterns and the 'laws' governing their development, to elucidate its plot or plan and thus to make its meaning intelligible and the prediction of its future course possible."[18]

It is mainly by constant exposure to historical writings that both the historian and the nonhistorian can get a glimpse and comprehension of the true nature of history. The eminent British historian Edward Hallett Carr concludes in his study[19] (a) that history deals exclusively with the unique and therefore does not quite repeat itself [Philip Guedalla was quite emphatic about this when he said, "History does not repeat itself; it is historians who repeat on another"[20]]; (b) that history, unlike science, cannot make predictions because it is nonrepeatable [Paul Valery expresses the same idea with unmatched frankness when he said that "history is the science of what never happens twice"[21]]; (c) that the events of history do not teach any lesson themselves; historians do; (d) that history is necessarily subjective since history is a viewing of the past with the colored lenses of the present; and (e) that history involves issues of religion and morality, which science does not. To this enumeration should be added the felicitous paradoxical epigram of Veronica Wedgewood, "History is an art, like the other science."[22]

Contact with good historical writings develops in the student a discriminating taste. He learns to distinguish the true historian from a pseudo-historian, the professional historical analyst from a mere annalist or chronicler. He learns to appreciate the intellectually stimulating historical writer from a hack writer of historical vignettes. He admires the imaginative constructive thinker and agrees with the uncompromising intransigent stand of the historian philosopher R. G. Collingwood against "scissors-and-paste historians." He esteems the unobtrusive craftsmen of history who work without fanfare and the quality of whose works are the ones that dignify them to the historian's profession. "The trouble with some peopeople," Professor Gabriel F. Fabella, first president emeritus of the Philippine Historical Association, used to say of poseurs or self-styled historians, "is that because they teach history, they think they are historians; because they have an article or a textbook on history published, they regard themselves as historians." No, sirs; a historian transcends the materials he has on hand. He analyzes, interprets, synthesizes, supplies an in-depth meaning and brings it forth for the appreciation of the reading world.

---

[17] *Man on His Past* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960), p. 238.

[18] Sturley, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

[19] *What Is History?* Cambridge: Penguin Books, 1961.

[20] S. T. Bindoff "Political History" in H. P. R. Finberg (Ed.) *Approaches to History* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962), p. 4.

[21] Sturley, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[22] Quoted in Lukacs, *op. cit.*, p. 19, footnote 16.

Approaches to History. Part of the professional value of history to historians and would-be historians is a knowledge of the various approaches employed by the writers, which depend on their line of specialization and interest. What are the uses of these approaches? What is their relevance?

1. Take political history. Sir John Seeley defines history as past politics, and politics as present history. Some historians have discredited this notion. At its face value it is vulnerable. Yet we study political history and we shall forever do so. Why? Is it because it is there?—like the main reason for climbing Mount Mayon: "because it is there?"

We study political history mainly because the history of nations is predominantly political. It is "the history of government in its widest sense,"[23] presenting the constitutional, the administrative, and the diplomatic or international aspects. Its value as a study rests on the claim that political history is the highest form of history because "it deals with man's highest form of activity as a social being."[24] If man is a political animal, which he is, then his history is necessarily political.

---

[23] Bindoff, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

We do not minimize the existence of other compelling reasons for the study of political history. One of them is to fill the human urge to rub elbows with the great, the famous, the wealthy. The living want to see themselves in the old Ayuntamiento Building in Intramuros with its elegant taste, its magnificent *salon de marmol.* They want to imagine themselves in solemn meditation under the cascading Gothic arches of Santo Domingo Church. The past is not an altogether impenetrable arcana. Through political history, the past can be exposed to full view and we are ushered into the innermost sanctum of Spanish colonial officials, of reverent eminences, of cassocked friars, to hobnob with scheming advisers and cunny or uncunny ministers, or probably take a peep into curtained chambers of *señoritas* and be privy to their naughty conversations.

The cult of personality is said to be a political exercise. When we want to know whether the age produced the great man, or vice versa, that is, whether the great man produced the age, we appeal to political history for the "case" studies.

2. What is the relevance of economic history? Economic history is "that part of history which requires a knowledge of economics for its full understanding."[25] It deals with economic factors, economic motives, economic foundations of society. Man's economic choices comprise its core. What these choices are, how and why they are made, and what the consequences will be. The transformation of society from primitive to the modern industrial owes itself to changes in economic choices both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Economic scarcities explain in part the migration of peoples from continent to continent as well as the emergence of Britain as industrial power, the development of economic thought and doctrines.[26] Lately, the economic historian has become a quantifier of history, employing the techniques and tools of the statistician.

3. Social history, it is claimed, its not a part of history. In the words of Professor Arthur Redford, however, "it is all history from the social point of view."[26] But what is the social

---

[25] W. H. B. Court "Economic History" in Finberg, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
[26] H. J. Perkin "Social History," *ibid.*, p. 54.

point of view? The social level includes "the way people live, the culture and religion . . . their scientific pursuits, and above all the general political concepts which serve to rationalize their relationship to the community."[27]

From social history we learn the natural history of the body politic; we come to understand its ecology, its anatomy, its physiology and pathology as well as its psychology. In sum, we learn the societal awareness of itself, its objectives, norms, and ideals.

The ecology of society refers to the physical environment, adaptation of which leads to social structure, which is its anatomy: population, complex associations, institutions, social classes. Physiology of society refers to the working, the operation, of the structure. Social physiology teaches how the people live and embraces such subjects as agriculture, industry, trade, legislation, public morality, education, religion, literature, music and arts, sports, and amusements. Society's pathology is concerned with social problems and their solution: social conflict, juvenile delinquency, human relations. Society's psychology is the way it reacts upon itself and includes the national objectives, the national criteria, public opinion, and national ideals.[28]

Lastly, the social historian concerns himself not only with social engineering, the putting up of, say, a welfare state, but also with a deeper ideal—that of the meaning and purpose of life *sub specie aeternitatis*. Thus social history brings to the fore the social questions of today. It has become a Cinderella, the queen of historical studies.[29]

Meaning of History. History is primarily a search for meaning. It is essentially an inquiry into the whys and wherefores of past phenomena. The inquiry leads to pattern forming, and the pattern comes to us from the historian's deft insight in the form of useful generalizations on the meaning of civilization. Here lies the chief value of history—the search for meaning.

---

[27] *Ibid.*
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 71.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

What is the explanation of the Greek way of life? What is the Christian view of history? To what have the rise and fall of the Roman Empire been attributed? What is Toynbee's grand conception of the law that governs human civilizations? What is Turner's frontier thesis? What is Karl Marx's theory or philosophy of history? These are some of the questions that occupied historians in their attempt at giving a meaningful interpretation of mankind's existence. These interpretations are like bridges that span the gulf of time between the past and the present and, by human design, between the present and the future, thus providing a unifying, coordinating and harmonizing element in the varied gamut of life. Let us take up some of these interpretive views.

1. The Cyclical View. — The ancient Greeks recognized the immortality of nature and the mortality of man. Nature, through its periodic cycle of regeneration and degeneration, is self-perpetuating. But man is different; he is mortal. Unlike nature, human life takes a rectilinear movement, which is negatively sloped, that is to say, downward, from birth to death. In this view, the worst and perennial enemy of mankind is time.

Plato, to cite an example, conceives his utopian aristocracy as gradually deteriorating through successive stages of political transformations from timocracy to oligarchy to democracy and to despotism. This deterioration he traces to racial degeneration because of the birth of biologically inferior individuals owing to errors in State regulation of marriages.[30]

But the Greeks had a great concern for greatness. They wanted to impart immortality to great men and deeds of great men. To gain immortality, an individual must attempt at achieving greatness. Thus nature and history take immortality as their common denominator. This union of nature and history gives rise to the cyclical or periodic theory of history. As well expressed by Hannah Arendt, "The connection between history and nature is therefore by no means opposition. History receives into its remembrance those mortals who through deed and word have proved themselves worthy of nature, and their everlasting fame means that they, despite their mortality, may remain in the company of the things that last forever."[31]

---

[30] J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (New York: Dover Publications, 1966), pp. 10-12.

According to the cyclical theory, human events occur periodically. History repeats itself. There may be a change in the dramatis personae, a different stage, a different scenery, and a different time, but the pattern is there. The imaginative Greeks depict history as *Ixion*, a man tied to the peripery of a big revolving wheel—self-pursued and self-pursuing.

Cyclically, there will always be a number of Troys and Trojan wars, an endless number of Helens and Ulysses, an endless number of Roman Empires, an endless number of Caesarisms, an endless number of Platonic *Dialogues*. Plato's *The Republic* was, in fact, followed by a long list of man's conception of what he thinks is the ideal society—Saint Augustine's *The City of God*, Thomas Hobbes' *The Leviathan*, Francis Bacon's *The Organon*, Thomas More's *Utopia*, Thomas Campanella's *Civitatis Solis* (City under the Sun), Karl Marx's *Communist Manifesto*, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, and George Orwell's *1984*, the last of which exemplifies what is known as negative utopia that expresses "an increasing pessimism and the 'farewell to progress' which animates enlarging conservative circles."[32] There will always be an endless number of political intrigues in the local, national, and international scenes, an endless number of subversives, of traitors who provide aid and comfort to the enemy.

A repeating cycle denies man of capability to improve himself. Human experience begins and ends with itself so that man is incapable of self-realization. A captive of time, man has no future. History has no meaning and use. As a votary of Clio has very well put it, in its solitary form cyclicalism is not a philosophy of history, but it held sway for centuries until the coming of Christ.[33]

---

[31] *Between Past and Future* (London: Faber and Faber, 1961), p. 48.

[32] Carl Joachim Friedrich, *Man and His Government* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963), p. 104.

[33] Donald B. Gawrenski, *History: Meaning and Method*, Revised Edition (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1969), p. 20.

2. The Christian or Providential View. — The coming of Christ introduced a new view of history, which was a radical departure from the cyclical theory. *Radical* because "the Christian view of history is not merely a belief in the direction of history by divine providence, it is a belief in the intervention by God in the life of mankind by direct action at certain definite points in time and place. The doctrine of the Incarnation which is the central doctrine of the Christian faith is also the centre of history . . ."[34] Thus from this center annals can be reckoned backwards and forwards.

Essentially unitary, the Christian conception of history has a beginning, a center, and an end, which are not ordinary historical events but acts of divine creation. It interprets time in terms of eternity and of human events in the light of divine revelation. The beginning is the period of the Old Testament, the period of providential preparation for the Incarnation, the center, which Saint Paul describes as "the fulness of time." The end is the realization of the divine purpose, namely, the establishment of the Kingdom of God. Consequently, the Christian theory is apocalyptic. It involves a "revolutionary reversal and transposition of historical values and judgments." Christianity transfers the meaning of history from the external world of historic events to the internal world of spiritual transformation, thus depicting a linear movement from the Creation of man, through the Incarnation, to the Last Judgment. It is the vision of the Last Judgment that provides the real, the true world-transforming power in the dynamics of history.

The classical expression of the Christian view of history finds itself in Saint Augustine's *De Civitatis Dei* (The City of God), the first formulation of a philosophy of history. St. Augustine interprets the course of universal history as an unceasing conflict between two dynamic forces which are found in two social orders—the City of Man and the City of God, Babylon and Jerusalem, this world and the world beyond, this earthly life and the heavenly life. History is the converging point of time and eternity. History owes its unity to divine power.

---

[34] Christopher Dawson, *Dynamics of World History*, edited by J. Mulley (London: Sheed and Ward, 1957), p. 235.

At the height of her imperial grandeur and splendor, the Romans were drunk with power and the ensuing corruption made the foundations of the empire shaky. When Alaric and his stampeding hordes of Goths swooped down upon Rome, it was an easy task to effect the capitulation. Such calamity as had never before happened to the Romans generated a wave of hostility against the Christians who were being made the scapegoat for the disaster. Saint Augustine rose to the defense of the Church. He argued that the loss of Rome was a providential intervention to chastise the Romans for their excesses.

Saint Augustine went further. He argued that the destruction of the *civitas terrestris* (Earthly City) did not matter anything. What mattered, he said, was the ultimate triumph of the City of God. He believed that there would always be a conflict between the forces of good and evil, between the God-fearing and the godless, the virtuous and the wicked and profane. Man has a purpose in life. Man knows he is *in* this world but is not *of* this world. The City of Man is only a caravansary, a kind of a wayside inn, or a "waiting room for eternity."[35] To qualify for admission to the City of God, man must live justly and in brotherly love with his fellowmen. The desire to qualify provides the dynamic element of the course of history as well as its direction. The relative peace and stability of the Medieval Age, which spanned some ten centuries, attests to the great value of the Christian view of history.

3. History as Progress.—The view that history sums up the idea of progress developed with the birth of scientific inquiry. The progressively materialistic outlook of peoples led to a new consciousness—from spirituality to materialism, from man as a helpless historical pawn to man as self-determinate, capable of controlling his environment and destiny, of providing direction to the present and of shaping his future.

Adherents of the progress thesis hold that mankind is continually and inevitably progressing. Placing more complete faith in the abilities of man rather than in divine intervention, man proceeds to build upon the achievements of preceding generations. Because progress is cumulative, the world gets better and better.

---

[35] Gawrenski, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

However, adherents of the progress view differ as to the ultimate consequences. One group claims that progress in the material field is endless. Another group predicts the establishment of the ultimate society. Still another group asserts that there is a limit to human history and that in eternity shall be found the real goal of mankind. All agree in the thought that our way of life in our time is steeped in and with the idea of progress.

Most famous of these views is that of Karl Marx, whose *Communist Manifesto* is a philosophy of history, with its principle of Hegelian dialectics: thesis, antithesis, synthesis, and back to thesis. According to Marx, the story of mankind is a story of class struggles, "between exploited and exploiting, between dominated and dominating classes at various stages of social development," to use his own words. The struggle keeps on until the proletariat class emerges as the victor and the capitalist class is eliminated. In other words, as long as the class struggles continue history shall exist. When the struggle is over with the enthronement of the proletariat class, history ends. Unfortunately, Karl Marx labored under what a liberal historian described as "an illusion of finality."

4. Variations of the Theme. — The cyclical, the providential, and the progress views of history are the three major interpretations of history. There are, however, variations.

Arnold Toynbee holds that the key to growth and progress of civilizations is "challenge and response."[36] "A society, we may say," he theorizes, "is confronted in the course of its life by a succession of problems which each member has to solve for itself as best it may. The presentation of each problem is a challenge to undergo an ordeal, and through this series of ordeals the members of the society progressively differentiate themselves from one another."[37] Civilizations are, like people taken collectively, subject to natural and biological laws.

---

[36] Toynbee, *op. cit.*, p. 67.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

The challenges inherent in the natural and biological laws, the responses to these challenges account for the circularity and linearity, respectively, of Toynbee's theory of history.

Auguste Comte postulates that human history consists of a long-drawn human struggle to discover the perfect laws of social living, which inevitably results in social change. Man, he says, is in possession of the capacity for progress provided he discovers the immutable laws that govern society.

Herbert Spencer is the father of Social Darwinism, the evolution of society from the simple homogeneous one to the complex heterogeneous form. Although he believes that cultures could decay, he asserts that the human race moves on in an upward and forward course.

Frederick S. Turner offers the frontier hypothesis to explain the development and direction of American civilization. The expanding frontier of America molded the character and institutions of modern America.

Charles A. Beard attributes to economic factors the shaping of American life and institutions. Economic factors dominate the framing of the American covenant, the operation of the governmental machinery, the social and economic development of the nation.

The intellectual approach to history introduced by James Henry Robinson, emphasizes the role and importance of ideas, culture, and social institutions in attempting to explain the growth of American civilization. This approach, refined into such sophisticated classification as political, behavioral, and sociological, is known otherwise as the "New History."

CONCLUSION

In the nature of things, there is a limit to every undertaking, there is an end to every task. Back in my mind, a Chinese proverb has started reminding me, "Silence is golden." The least said, the better. So I am going to end my lecture presently, with a summing up.

What is the relevance of the past? What is the use and meaning of history? What is history for?

I take pleasure in passing on to you what historians think of the subject.

R. G. Collingwood:

> Lastly, what is history for? My answer is that history is 'for' human self-knowledge. It is generally thought to be of importance to man that he should know himself: where knowing himself means knowing not his merely personal peculiarities, the things that distinguish him from other men, but his nature as man. Knowing yourself means knowing, first, what it is to be a man; secondly, knowing what it is to be the kind of man you are; and thirdly, knowing what it is to be the man *you* are and nobody else is. Knowing yourself means knowing what you can do; and since nobody knows what he can do until he tries, the only clue to what man can do is what man has done. The value of history, then, is that it teaches us what man has done and thus what man is.[38]

Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters:

> In the training of the intellect, it would be rash to claim for history results which no other study could produce, but there are certain skills of the mind which the subject is well fitted to exercise and improve. Accuracy in apprehension and statement, ability to distinguish what is relevant and to select what is important—these are at least as necessary in studying history as in other disciplines. More peculiar to history itself are the weighing of evidence, the detection of bias, the distinguishing of truth from falsehood, or at least the probable from the impossible.[39]

Cantor and Schneider:

> Historical study allows the student to perceive how the world of today came into existence and how the texture of experience that distinguishes his particular family and community was built up by a complex combination of forces and events over many decades and perhaps centuries . . . History is therefore a road to self-knowledge and a means of understanding the attitudes and motives of people of disparate backgrounds. Last but certainly not least, history is worth studying because it is a creative act. It not only allows for but demands serious application and industry, the exercise of a creative imagination, and high qualities of literary exposition.[40]

---

[38] Collingwood, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[39] Quoted by Sturley, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[40] Norman F. Cantor and Richard I. Schneider, *How to Study History* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell C., 1967), p. 3.

History as Social Science*

Samson A. Lucero

"STRENUOUSLY HEAVY is the weight on the shoulders of a chief of state." That, I hope all of you will agree, is a statement of general truth. It implies a moral commitment, a political responsibility, a sociological sense, a mathematical concept, an all-embracing social order. In short, to analyze and understand its reality involves all the sciences, particularly the social sciences.

Let's look into its anatomy. Strain, like stress, can be a proper concern of physics; likewise heavy and weight represent a combination of units which scientific research may quantify. Weight on the shoulders is less of a trouble and more of an issue; more social than individual. When sought for and acquired or when delegated and accepted, a moral element gets involved. A chief is certainly a headman of a group, of no less than a community; maybe of a barangay, a tribe, a nation, or even of a fire department! In every instance it involves a social organization. Chief of state, needless to say, is one of the focal points in the subject matter of political science. Briefly, therefore, the mode of thinking of an historian should be informed by the diverse approaches used by the neighboring social science disciplines if only the study of society could bring one closest to the reality of humanity.

It is proposed that a meeting of the minds, a dialogue, a pooling of intellectual resources in the free market of ideas should be made by the allied sciences. Ivory towers should be dismantled, high walls of professional jealousies should be demolished and traditional hostilities should instead be replaced by a desire for coexistence in the academic sphere and in the world of science.

---

* Lecture delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the National Historical Commission and the Philippine Historical Association at the University of San Carlos, Cebu City, on September 21, 1973.

The trouble with scholars or scientists who, at the same time, teach especially their respective fields of specialization, is the tendency to jealously promote their particular areas to such extent that they turn their back on each other and then stake a selfish claim to competence. This is especially true among the so-called social scientists. The claim to a vested interest, as in any endeavour, only induces a discordance which renders inutile the efforts at unity and collaboration so essential in the achievement of the common goals designed to make the teaching-learning process more effective.

THE ROOTS OF INTERDISCIPLINARY HOSTILITY

Interdisciplinary hostility can be traced back to the 18th century when social history had to strive against the dominance of political history.[1] This was because the latter enjoyed a superior prestige since it was closely associated with expanding nationalism and at the same time it was the most convenient vehicle for promoting patriotism. In the 19th century historians feared that adoption of sociological concepts and techniques would transmute social into sociological history.[2] The historian's belief that sociology would reduce history to the secondary role of fact-collection bred hostility towards a possible rival. On the other hand, the sociologist not only disliked the historian's claim to a monopoly of all recorded human behavior, but also criticized historical data as unreliable and inadequate. And in the present century, the fact that history had become a recognized academic discipline for the study of man in society has certainly spurred it to nurture its hostility to social sciences which study the same subject matter.[3] Even to this day there is an interchange of hostility among the related disciplines. The persistence of hostility is partly due to our emphasis of a basic contrast between the disciplines. It is maintained that history is ideographic; hence, it is concerned with the singular, therefore descriptive, as against the generalization and abstraction made possible by the concern of sociology with what is regular, the latter being nomothetic.[4] And while historians have a lot of arguments against the social studies and social sciences, yet they, in turn, are targets of retaliatory attacks for, according to Derek Heater in writing about history and the social sciences, "ivory towers are under siege from the social scientists . . ."[5]

---

[1] J. Jean Hecht, "Social History," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* vi (1960), p. 455.

[2] Hecht, "Current Trends," *ibid.*, p. 459.

THE TREND TOWARDS RAPPROCHEMENT

There is a growing trend in favor of interdisciplinary exchange in general. This is stimulated by the clearly visible advantages consequent to close cooperation between history and the rest of the social sciences. Sociologists who have fully become aware of the historical orientation of their discipline have joined the bandwagon and have produced genuine sociological history. It is this challenge from the outside that, according to J. Jane Hecht, the social historians have to put themselves "under the tutelage of the sociologists in order to transform their discipline."[6]

Historians, especially the young crop in the profession, are not only challenged but are disillusioned by the obsolescence of the traditional approach. Since the time that the research methodology of history was brought to perfection by Ranke a hundred years ago, it has remained virtually unchanged up to the present. March Bloch was dismayed by the contrast between the historian's scrupulous care in ascertaining the historicity of an event and the apparent clumsiness with which he explains it.[7] This dissatisfaction has awakened an interest in the neoidealist tradition of historical thinking and has produced a new awareness of social science and its relevance for historical study. It is thus that the historian is reaching out for contact with the social sciences.

---

[3] Derek Haeter, "History and the Social Sciences," *New Movement in the Study and Teaching of History,* Martin Ballard, ed. (Bloomington & London; Indiana University Press, 1970), p. 135.

[4] Hecht, "Current Trends," *op. cit.*, p. 460.

[5] Heater, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

[6] Hecht, "The Rapprochement of History and Sociology," *op. cit.*, p. 461.

The admission of so much new data into the historian's field of study since the start of the present century is another factor which has accelerated his inclination towards the social sciences. The amount of material that has come within his province of study has become so tremendous as to strain his capacity to grasp it in its entirety. This led to the development of distinct areas in the study of historical data. And yet this in turn produced chaos as a result of the struggle for supremacy among the different specialized branches of historical knowledge (economic, social, political, etc.). Such a situation required a new principle of order which can arise only through generalization. And the problem of where and how the historian generalizes can lead the historian to a communion with the social sciences by adopting the new techniques of quantification and by the use of demonstrable facts.

This communion can deliberately be cultivated through the common interests of all concerned. And humanity is the common subject matter of those who look at men as they are represented in books or in works of art, and those who look at men as they appear in institutions and in direct visible action. This indeed illustrates that humanity is the central and essential matter of interest to social scientists and humanists alike, as pointed out by Redfield.[8] The historians should certainly welcome this partnership since it would enrich and improve their work especially since the scientific character of the social sciences is now well established.

It is a cause for felicity that rapprochement among the allied disciplines is coming to a head for this will indeed help in promoting peace and international understanding. This is well put by Toynbee in his "Widening Our Historical Horizon" when he points out that the time has come when anything that happens to any fraction of mankind anywhere has come to be a matter of concern for all the rest of us; that we have to come to terms and coexist with each other if we are to save ourselves from destroying each other, and that this necessity sets us to take on the additional task of studying, teaching, and learning.[9] And this is echoed by Dr. Franklin in a lecture he made recently at the USIS here in Cebu indicating the desire to stimulate communication between scholars from all parts of the world when he said, "I am trying to build up and encourage an international community of scholars. I feel that if you have people of common interests and they have experiences with each other that are good experiences it is going to be very difficult to drag those kinds of people into wars and, if that community is large enough, it will increase the chances for peace."[10]

---

[7] H. Stuart Hughes, "The Historian and the Social Scientist," *The American Historical View,* LVI (October, 1960), 20-46.

[8] Robert Redfield, "Sociology among the Humanities," *Readings on Modern Sociology,* Alex Inkeles, ed. (New Jersey; Prentice-Hall Inc., 1966), p. 37.

THE HISTORIAN AS SOCIAL SCIENTIST

The historian who at the same time teaches history can have a double impact upon the society which he serves. And this can be more so if he is at the same time a social scientist. It is both possible and desirable for a historian to be a social scientist.

Gottschalk says that history may partake of the nature of the social sciences and he gathers from Merle Curti's *Theory and Practice in Historical Study* that the historian who "also seeks to reach generalizations that appear to be valid and to provide creditable explanations of the development of contemporary events, thoughts, manner, and institutions, is, by the extra effort, no less, and may be more, a historian."[11] Gottschalk further states that "the humanist historian can be the social scientist of the past and can relate areas, epochs, and lines of development to broader concepts and social generalizations if he cares and dares to make the additional effort." Notwithstanding the differences, basic or otherwise, it is clear that adoption of the social science approach is feasible. After all the historical and social science methods and perspectives are complementary rather than contradictory. The thing to do for the practitioners, historians and teachers alike, is to make a conscious effort to assimilate, when possible, the best that there is of the techniques of the social scientists.

---

[9] Arnold Toynbee, "Widening Our Historical Horizon," *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History,* Martin Ballard, ed. (Bloomington & London; Indiana University Press, 1970), p. 50.

[10] Dr. John Hope Franklin was sponsored by the Philippine-American Educational Foundation and the USIS in his lecture which brought him to Cebu City. He served as Chairman of the Department of History at Brooklyn College and occupied the same position for three years at the University of Chicago.

[11] Louis Gottschalk, *Understanding History* (New York; Alfred A. Knoff, Inc., 1950), p. 31.

First of all, the historian must decide to adopt and adapt generalization in the writing, study and teaching of history. Confidence in doing this can be developed by understanding and reconciling himself with such terms as cause and law, level of schematization, quantification, observed regularities, cultural configuration, intellectual certainty as against self-doubt, projective tests, extrapolation and the like. An insight into the problem may be had through the following summary outline of a pertinent portion of an essay on the subject by H. Stuart Hughes.[12]

The use of generalization in history can be on different planes where differing criteria of judgment apply. They may be characterized in terms of: (1) semantic aspects, (2) grouping of statements, (3) schematization, and (4) metahistory.

Semantic aspects are the simplest and commonest form of generalization. They are built into historical language in the form of verbs or nouns (i.e., verbs like "revolutionize" or nouns like "nation").

Grouping of statements about events is generalization that commonly occurs in the topical sentences of the paragraphs of historical writing, or, in more abstract form, in the "conclusions" of a chapter or book. Generalizations of this second type lack explicit recognition of the assumptions on which they are founded. (Example: Rizal, a victim of his times, died a tragic death in the hands of unjust men.)

Schematization is a fitting of the pieces of historical data into an organized form in terms of process or structure. By process we usually mean a coherent theory of change through time as implied in such words as "industrialization" or "urbanization". By structure we suggest a more static cross section of a particular situation in the past. On this third plane the procedure of historical generalization is close to that of social science. The order of business, however, is reversed. A social scientist states a generalization for which history is expected to supply data or examples. A historian works the other way around: for him a generalization serves as a possible organizing principle to be applied to the specific series of events with which he is concerned.

---

[12] Hughes, *loc. cit.*

Metahistory deals with all-inclusive systems shunned by self-respecting historians. Yet it provides the historian imaginative reconstruction and poetic suggestion. Its theories are seldom empirically verifiable for being too far removed from precise data and much too heavily leaded with assumptions and variables, but, as imaginative hypotheses, they offer the indispensable raw material for subsequent criticism and elaboration.

A satisfactory approach to the problem of generalization in history and the related question of history and social science is possible if the concepts of "cause" and "law" are restored to the historian's vocabulary. In spite of the sharp distinction between them, we shall, on closer inspection, find them to be intimately related. Explanation in terms of cause suggests a lawful universe. Causal explanation may be considered as simply an example of the operation of a more general law.

Here, it is necessary to define the concept of "cause" with greater precision. Historians use some form of this concept even when they do not explicitly recognize it. (The use of "cause" immediately gives warning that causal explanation is at hand). The term "cause" should be reinstated and at the same time be refined and employed in more skeptical fashion. This statement is explained a little further in three respects.

First, causal reasoning is based on the assumption that human behavior is just as lawful as events in the realm of nature. Assuming that the workings of the universe are lawful, scientists explain that in the study of man, as in the natural sciences in their twentieth-century form, what we call "laws" are not strict and universal causal generalization in the old sense, but are simply observed regularities expressing themselves as statistical probabilities. In this contemporary usage there is no radical distinction between the two fields of knowledge.

Second, since despite the contrary (e.g., if human behavior is capable of rational explanation at all, clearly there must be something lawful about it), it is still argued that in the human world it is impossible to arrive at laws which in any sense give a complete explanation of even the simplest human action, then the most satisfactory type of causal explanation in history must be stated. Such a one simply tries to locate the factor which, when removed, would make the decisive difference in a given sequence of events, making such events inconceivable. This procedure may have drawbacks (viz., subjective origin; particular standpoint), but if rigorously carried out, it offers more precision than any other type of causal explanation commonly used.

Finally, the above procedure implies the possibility of running alternative causal sequences based on alternative criteria of importance, as Weber did in his studies of capitalism and religion. But the neatness of Weber's treatment obscured the complexity of the procedure as it usually presents itself to historians. Weber simplified his problem by dealing with only two variables. Historians usually are obliged to reckon with many more which are frequently of incommensurable nature.

This incommensurability does not mean that they are incompatible. It all depends on the individual historian's focus of interest. Thus the outbreak of the First World War can be explained in several different and complementary ways (basic cause viewed from different angles). So much for law and cause. The foregoing was simply a summary of where the best recent studies in the analytical philosophy of history currently situate the problem. And it also paved the way to the logical approach to our mean interest which is the third plane of historical generalization—the level of schematization. For without some clear concept of law and cause, the notion of schematization would be meaningless. Realizing this, Weber coined the term "ideal type" to describe the explanatory construction that brings order into a complex body of material. As a procedure by which a series of phenomena can be shown of their more eccentric features and hence made comparable to other historical manifestations, the procedure of ideal type construction is approximately the equivalent of schematization.

And now the question of how the concepts of social science may be applied to historical study. They cannot be used as complete causal explanations nor as general laws. They may be applied, rather, as ideal types. Customarily this has been done by some sort of introspective procedure. As an example, psychoanalytic theory offers a more coherent set of explanations. Social scientists could find many others. Briefly, by applying mutually interdependent generalizations of varying degrees of probability, drawn from the social sciences, with no one of them considered either exhaustive or exclusive, historians can begin to refine and to make explicit their whole procedure of explanation.

At this point we can see clearly the relation between history and social science. While radical dissimilarity in intellectual goal has emerged, we have also found a very important difference in traditional procedure. History will remain in its original literary tradition and the historian will continue to draw up imprecise "explanation sketches" rather than to employ the narrower and more rigorous methods of social sciences. However, this looser sort of procedure is by no means necessarily "unscientific." It can become perfectly acceptable as social science, if, on the one hand, historians are quite conscious of their own imprecision and if, on the other hand, social scientists recognize that the "explanation sketches" devised by their historical colleagues are impressionistic and require much subsequent "filling in" and are rather to be considered as rough outlines subject to very gradual establishment or discrediting. Meanwhile the social sciences have been developing to a point where it is now possible to find in them a wide and varied range of hypotheses fully capable of historical application.

And so the imaginary debate with the social scientist may be provisionally settled in the following fashion: since history has no generalizations of its own—since the only specifically historical category is that of time sequence—it must necessarily borrow its intellectual rationale from elsewhere. As yet, neither historians nor social scientists have been able to agree on generalizations of a universal explanatory power. There is no reason, however, why the range of generalization cannot gradually be widened so as to build out from schematization or ideal types a bolder and more closely interlocking fund of explanations in terms of process and structure.

Now a bold assertion that a certain amount of social science theory can profitably be exploited for the purposes of, or "application" in, historical explanation obviously requires much explanation of its own. It is necessary to show, if only in fragmentary fashion, the approximate range through which such novel procedures can operate.

The first clarification is to explain once and for all that by "application" is here not meant any mechanical or one-to-one superimposing of social science theory on traditional historical prose. This is the most persistent misconception that dogs the trail of those of us who argue for closer relations between history and its sister disciplines. There should be no occasion for us to be accused of "selling out" to the professional enemy.

Here again the example of psychoanalytic theory may serve to illuminate. Obviously the historian who wants to make use of the work of Freud and his successors is not obliged to give equal credit to everything they ever wrote. He may pick and choose. Thus the historian may well find that concepts like "projection" and "sublimation" are exactly what he needs to guide his account, while the notion of a "primal crime" is simply too fantastic to be considered.

Moreover, very frequently the word "application" is too immediate and concrete to describe accurately what the historian may most profitably do with the insights of others. In many cases he does not really "apply" them at all. He lets them remain in the back of his mind. He does not parade his knowledge of social science theory: he simply permits his thoughts to be informed by it. A process of this kind subtly alters the character of a historian's work in ways that even the writer himself may be unaware of. The new type of knowledge he has absorbed will actually have worked subterranean alterations in his whole mode of thought and expression: his choice of vocabulary and his explanatory line will be different, even though the cast of his prose remains irreproachably literary and discursive.

A second clarification has to do with the relative congeniality of the different social science disciplines for the historian. Some are clearly more adaptable than others to the uses to which the historical scholar would like to put them. The various disciplines rank, on a fairly apparent scale of applicability, with experimental psychology (due to rigorous criteria of evidence and narrow level of abstraction) at one end and cultural anthropology at the other (for the student of exotic culture adopts a highly permissive attitude towards his data). Cultural anthropology is congenial in the extreme. Indeed, the approach of the cultural anthropologists so closely resembles that of the historian so frequently as to seem identical with it.

Finally, we come to the real point of difference which calls for the most important clarification. It is the mathematical "model building." The lessons of Weber or Durkheim or Freud did not present history with so much intellectual difficulty. They were close enough to the literary tradition to permit their fairly rapid absorption into the canon of historical thought. A mathematical model, however, offers a challenge of quite a different sort. It is due to its substitution of symbols for words, its insistence on precise definition at every stage, and the closed and unequivocal character of its conclusions. The historian is not welcome in these premises unless he becomes a Puritan. Between ridicule of the innovators and capitulation to them no middle course seems to offer itself.

Actually there is such a course, but it is a difficult one to chart. The historian may begin to learn something of mathematics, statistics, and symbolic logic. Then at least he would know what the mathematician, the statistician and the logician were talking about when they argued for or against techniques of this sort. Beyond that he should keep an open mind toward the possibilities of quantification and not reject the notion of number for being incompatible with the historian's craft.

Historians have been applying quantitative methods. Biographies, economic affiliations, and voting records have been tabulated and cross-referenced to give a new precision and concreteness to the study of parliamentary bodies and similar elite groups. These however, are simply the initial steps in a perspective of quantification. In the areas of human experience, historians earlier dismissed the quantitative approach as out of the question. It was only when the sociologists and the social psychologists began experimenting with novel techniques for dealing with such matters in the contemporary world that historians were able to see how much had been missed in the standard literary treatments of the past.

Opinion surveys, sampling techniques, projection tests, content analysis, "scaling," and the like are the new procedures with which the scientists of human behavior have enriched our knowledge of contemporary society and, by extrapolation, our understanding of history itself. For it is only half correct to object that these techniques cannot be applied to people who have long since been in their graves. But one can learn from the results of present-day samplings to look with new eyes at the records of comparable events in the past. Such large-scale movements as revolutions and wars clearly show certain abiding characteristics, and historians have had long experience in applying to them the essential correctives that take account of differences in time and cultural circumstances. A rigorously conducted measurement of attitudes in contemporary society has a direct historical relevance: it can illuminate the past through the new types of interpretation that it suggests.

TEACHING HISTORY

So far we have tried to cover a wide area of the whole horizon of history as a social science. The possibilities of wide-ranging application of the more advanced techniques devised by sister disciplines are definite and clear. But as may be gleaned from the lengthy "sumary-outline" above, it is obvious that the initial breakthrough is more in the realm of writing and study of history and less in the area of teaching. Hence there is need to push the advantage further into the teaching-learning process. Our job, therefore, is to know what sort of history is worthwhile teaching in particular levels of education.

There are a lot of things worthwhile in the teaching of the social sciences.[13] In general, we seek to develop the intellect, to train the mind in precise thinking, to provide practical value out of the knowledge learned from the study of man and his society, to clear up deceptive notions prevalent in human organizations, to foster an inter-disciplinary awareness, and, last but not least, to cultivate the sense of internationalism, nationalism, and a sincere desire to get involved in the task of nation-building.

The teaching of history is not just the manner, it is more of the matter. The reverse of this is what really is wrong in the treatment of history at all levels according to Elton.[14] Hence, the question of what sort of history to teach and the levels where or when to treat the matter, merits our attention. The levels referred to here are that of the primary, the secondary, and the university. In the first level, history taught through the social studies should not be "serious" history (economic, constitution, ideas) which requires some maturity. Stories of war, exploration, great men and especially progress in science will suffice. There is no need to instill a sense of the past. The teacher should simply be guided by the linear development of man's habits and circumstances. This way he would be able to persuade his charges that history has point and could repay further attention. Teaching history at this level has failed if the pupil does not want to go on.

In the secondary level, such pitfalls as emphasis on indoctrination (historical distortions in the name of patriotism and nationalism) or on local investigations (research) should be avoided. This could only lead to a myopic view. The inclination to concentrate on recent times produces the illusion that knowledge of this period enables the young to understand their own present better. Studying societies very much like our own to explain our own is the worst conceivable way in which to liberate the mind from a preoccupation with the present day and from an inner conviction that the standards, values and attitudes of the present are the only standards, values and attitudes possible to man. Besides, premature involvement in academic history not only kills the desire for it in the university level but, as explained above, also produces a closed mind and a fixed set of attitudes. Then again under present conditions and trends, history is taught, like everything else, according to the demands of college entrance examinations. Here, the invocation for the assistance of Divine Providence is urgent in the preparation of proper and valid questions which is necessarily and usually hasty. Teaching history at this level can really hope to do only two things: first, to maintain a passionate interest in the past, and second, to create a willingness to think about the past as real, as real as the present and as fully entitled to its own existence. It should be a kind of teaching intended to advance maturity; to achieve a balanced, receptive mind which is flexible and open to new ideas, but at the same time capable of assessing them against that which is traditional. It should, therefore, promote responsibility as against naivete and bring about a better kind of maturity.

---

[13] Amado A. Castro, "What We Want to Achieve in Teaching the Social Sciences," *The Teaching-Learning Process,* Hernando J. Abaya, ed. (Pines Hotel, Baguio; UP Faculty Conference, 1967), pp. 311ff.

[14] G. R. Elton, "What Sort of History Should We Teach?", *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History,* Martin Ballard, ed. (Bloomington & London; Indiana University Press, 1970), pp. 221-230.

With such foundation in the pre-college level, the university freshman must now commend himself into the competent hands of his professors for guidance and inspiration. He must now genuinely feel some awe in face of the magnitude of the past, must reach out for some vision of ages not his own, must have some ability to sink himself in minds and circumstances so very different from those with which he has been equipped by the accident of birth. Otherwise, he has not even begun to be ready for the study of academic history; and what is more, he is a long way from being a valuable human being. It is thus that history should be a social science if the teaching of which must contribute to the formation of the whole man.

The Relation of History To other Academic Disciplines *

Concesa Milan-Baduel

HISTORY IS THE MOST WONDERFUL word in any language. Its main ingredient is the glorious past, its dessert is the fluctuating present and its flavor the uncertain future. The history teacher is the sophisticated wizard who makes a delicious cocktail of what has been, what is and what will be.

Here assembled are teachers of history and presumably historians too. You are making history. But you all look so young and so refreshing that we have forgotten what we intended to say about historians and history teachers. You are a far cry from the traditional concept of eggheads interested in the past—a wrinkled face, horn-rimmed glasses, dehydrated skin, a sunken, shrinking figure, white corpuscles and wobbly steps. If you were all these—thank God you're not—we would have addressed you the "Young ONCE." But you are the young ONES.

And as such, do we know where we are going? Do we have a philosophy for the teaching of history and/or integrating it with other disciplines? Did we become historians and

---

* Lecture delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the National Historical Commission and the Philippine Historical Association at the University of San Carlos, Cebu City, on September 22, 1973.

history teachers by choice, by intent, by preference, by inclination, by accident, by circumstance, by force of personality, by ulterior motive, or as a last resort?

An elderly professor was once asked what history is and he replied: "I am history."

The major premise of this moment's discussion is: "Every teacher is an history teacher." Verily, history is in all subject areas, but I suppose I am barking at the wrong tree, so to speak. If this were an assemblage of English instructors, science teachers, music lovers, math mentors, economics experts, engineers and political scientists, perhaps I could have convinced them that history is inter-related with their discipline. But you are already involved in history and definitely you would feel offended if any of the other professions will turn deaf and mute against history.

Nonetheless, it is not redundant to explain here the marriage of history with other disciplines. The personality of the teacher, it has to be pointed out at the start, becomes the moving factor in making history attractive and fit for spiritual consumption. How many of our language professors, physics instructors, science teachers and business mentors *do* really know their history? Ninety-nine and nine-tenths per cent of suffrage users may know that Napoleon was defeated at Waterloo. Napoleon was the vanquished. Do they know who the victor was?

This is analogous to the Cebuanos encouraging tourists to view the Magellan monument, but forget to point out the statue of the first victorious activist against foreign domination, the immortal Lapulapu.

Incidentally, have the Philippine Historical Association and the National Historical Commission decided on the weapon with which the Cebuano warrior conquered the great Spanish conquistador? This has to be looked into if we are to survive as historians, worthy of the name. Besides, all teachers in all levels have to be of necessity a walking historical encyclopedia, lest they be found flat-footed by ever-curious, insatiable students.

HISTORY AND RESEARCH

"Herodotus was basically a story-teller and a superb one, and his history is a combination of fact and fable."* One finds shrewd and accurate observations as well as tales beyond the reasonable limits of credibility.

History must be scientific. Research is the handmaiden of history. For a variety of reasons man wants to know what men who have preceded him have done or thought. Probably because of his consciousness of the finite nature of human life, man is eager and even anxious to find a bridge to earlier generations which have faced this same disconcerting realization.

Never before has there been a greater need for history than today. Krug believes that historical links to the past may well soften the fear or uncertainty about the meaning of existence by placing it in the perspective of past ages of human struggles, failures and accomplishments. History seems to be an expression of, and an answer to, the deeply felt need of human beings everywhere to know of their collective past. Studies of amnesia victims reveal how unsettling and terrifying is the loss of memory. With the aid of research, history has recovered the collective past of previous generations.

J. B. Bury says, "History is a science, no less and no more." The research enthusiast takes full advantage of this and proceeds with the historical method of presenting and interpreting collated data.

HISTORY AND LITERATURE

History must not be brought into the classroom as immutable fact. It must be humanized for instructional purposes. There is a need for making the teaching of history not as history consisting of facts and dates, but great, inspiring and instructive narrative history. Leopold von Ranke says, "History is concerned with things as they really happened." It can therefore be taught as great literature: the truth and nothing but the truth, with a difference.

To a great extent literature is history fictionized. If we agree with Benedetto Crose that "all history is contemporary history," then all writing is history in the making. The thoughts of the poet, the novelist, and the dramatist are undoubtedly the reflections of their era, indicative of their moods, their aspirations, their ambitions.

---

* Mark M. Krug, *History and the Social Sciences* (Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1967), p. 5.

A number of novels are historical in setting and portray rulers: kings and presidents—as men of feelings with their frustrations and their fame. Again, fictionists may be encouraged to view historical data with more accuracy and less romance.

J. B. Bury of Cambridge says:

> History is not a branch of literature. The facts of history, like the facts of geology or astronomy, can supply materials for literary art; for manifest reasons they lend themselves to artistic representation more readily than those of the natural sciences; but to clothe the story of human society in a literary dress is no more the part of a historian than it is the part of an astronomer to present in artistic shape the story of the stars.

HISTORY AND COMMUNICATION ARTS

Even our everyday language reflects our dependence on history. Writers, lecturers, debaters, conference organizers, statesmen, and the man on the street use such expressions as "the lesson of history," "the verdict of history," "history teaches us," "history will show," "history proves" and "history is on our side."

Why this pre-occupation for history? Man in his subconscious wants to have an assurance of immortality. The language instructor can be the most potent agent for bringing this about. The study of history has been required of all school children since ancient times. Does it mean that knowledge of historical events will give the reader a perfect understanding of causal relationships or a scientific insight into conflict resolutions? Does it give man a broader base for his day-to-day struggles and enable him to be more articulate about the things concerning his existence

The student of English grammar may find history a rich source for sentence analysis and syntax. If properly manipulated by the language professor, historical data may provide the illustrations for structure and form. Orations recorded in the pages of history are fertile exercises for the promising speech student who aims at elocution as a personal talent. Even speech instructors must be pragmatic, realistic and integrative. Sentence patterns and diction drills may be based on history. Integration has been succesfully utilized for this purpose.

HISTORY AND MATHEMATICS

The mathematics teacher makes full use of historical data —ideas once taught in previous years. He may not admit his indebtedness to history, but certainly the principles he uses have been the heritage of the ages. Although, however, Kierkagaard, as given by his biographer, once trembled at the thought of his ideas becoming one day a subject-matter to be learned from textbooks for examination purposes.

The development of mathematics has its own history, its own growth. The discovery of new formulas, new principles is not expected to end, and men with the keenness of Euclid and Einstein will find other theories of probability and relativity, of geometry and symbolism. Couched in history are the mathematicians of the ages and the discussion of their achievements will be truly reflective of the times in which they lived.

HISTORY AND SOCIOLOGY

Very easily discernible is the compatibility between history and sociology. G. J. Renier says, "History is the story of the experience of men living in civilized societies." Arnold Toynbee glorifies history as the "search for light on the nature and destiny of man." The sociology instructor manages history with intuition, an in-depth approach which allows for a far better understanding of man as he resolves the increasing complexities of existence.

It can be argued that human societies are too complex, the variables of human life are too numerous to make direct applications of past solutions to present problems possible or even desirable. But the study of history gives the sociologist a sense of perspective and the inevitable tolerance of all types of human behavior.

Krug, in his book, relates of the shift from microsociology. This calls for a broad analysis of large societal issues, such as peace and war and race relations. "The focus of social analysis," wrote its chief protagonist, Professor Amitai Etzioni of Columbia University:

> and its raison d'etre, are the problems of the age, the application of sociology to the understanding of society, its major sub-collectives, and a society's place in more encompassing communities.

He thinks that sociology has paid too much attention to low-level, concrete social problems and has neglected the larger societal issues. This shift will draw the sociologist and the historian closer together. Even more important in this rapprochement is the growing respect among the sociologists and historians for each other's discipline.

It may be wise to caution the social studies instructor that the best approach to the teaching of historical events is to correlate them with the general concepts of sociology not in unrelated and disjointed way, but by a sensible fusion of both, whenever such fusion is logical and possible.

The social scientist asks, "Is history relevant? Does it sustain life? Does it give meaning to life? Does it assist man to raise himself from either moral bankruptcy or social decadence? How may it be used to help bring about greater progress? The traditional historical method of verifying data would profit greatly from the use of insights that the social scientists have gained on the nature of man. Thus, the historian and the social scientist are Damon and Pythias, in a sense.

HISTORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

The historian is ready to acknowledge the contributions made by political science in the development of rigorous research designs and the application of precise methods of analysis to the study of political behavior. Sir John Seeley says that history is "past politics." The political scientist learns his lessons from the pages of the past.

History, however, may not just be a chronicle of the past. It is an effective means of teaching good government and of inculcating ethical values. Great rulers used the past as a guide for action, because history includes social mores, economics, philosophy and moral precepts. History is a mirror—the mirror of the sinner and the saint, the vanquished and the victor, the sophisticate and the naive, the shrewd and the simple, the dreamer and the doer.

Character education encompasses the life of great men whose stage is history. The guidance counselor knows that history is an on-going drama, continuing and to be continued. The blunders of emperors and presidents may be traced to childhood experiences which at once are the panorama of guidance and counseling techniques. Perhaps we all agree with Arnold Toynbee that the life of each culture is a self-contained cycle of origin, growth and decay.

The Philippines under martial law is trying to recover a scrupulous past. We join Toynbee again in the attempt to retrieve a rich cultural heritage "in a contrite spirit and with a broken heart." The Filipino will rise above this misery. Under a new society he will recapture the lost greatness through national discipline and personal sacrifice.

History has been a powerful force in the creation of nations. What binds groups of people together in a community of nationhood is primarily a common past, a feeling of communality of interests in the present, and common aspirations for the future. The narration of history, the memory of past glories or grievances and the dream of unfulfilled future aspirations all forming a part of a nation's history, have contributed mightily to the rise of nationalism. The story of national heroes and their deeds is imbedded deeply in the national consciousness and has always evoked, and still does, profound emotions.

The political science instructor can be a very effective instrument in stimulating a genuine affection for one's country; its growth and its progress. Political science is the closest sibling to history.

HISTORY AND ECONOMICS

Economic history has been a distinguished branch of history for a long time. Borrowing generously from Krug, it can be said that in spite of the growing influence of econometricians in the discipline of economics, there is evidence to suggest the existence of large areas of cooperation between history and economics. W. W. Rostow suggested that the study of the problem of economic growth may become a fruitful meeting ground between history and economic. Political independence becomes a farce if the national stomach is empty.

Historians who wish to study economics problems in the broad content of the political, social and cultural structure and values, and the economists who are largely concerned with the problem of distribution of scarce resources can find a large area of fruitful cooperation.

Setting aside for a moment the question on whether economics should be taught as a separate subject or integrated in the study of history, it must be remembered that the teaching of economics is supposed to provide students with a general understanding of economic principles and policies. Such an understanding would give students a knowledge of the ways in which nations rise and fall. The greatest social problem is economic. If economics is to be taught as part of other courses, then, it should be integrated explicitly and imaginatively by competent teachers.

HISTORY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Psychological insights in the area of motives and personality traits are of great value to historians.

William L. Langer and H. Stuart Hughes seem to be fascinated by the potential contribution of psychoanalysis to history, especially to the field of biography. They agree that historians have, on the whole, ignored what Erik Ericson has defined as "the fateful function of childhood in the fabric of society." Professor Hughes sees a great affinity between historians and psychoanalysts.

It has been suggested that some Ph.D. candidates in history go through the process of psychoanalysis to be prepared to use psychoanalytical insights in their historical investigations. Likewise, psychology professors may avail of the biographical data of history's greats in explaining certain paradoxes in human life.

HISTORY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

The anthropologist welcomes Samuel Eliot Morison's evaluation of history as the "story of man." Consciously or unconsciously the anthropologist brings to the fore the superstar of history: man.

Since anthropology claims an interest in man, his works and his thoughts at all times and in all places, its affinity to history is obvious. The difference lies in the points of emphasis and methodology. The main thrust of anthropology is the comparative study of man in particular groups. Its chief method of investigation is the field study. As in history, it tries to avoid subjective value statements and to present that which is scientific and objective in a field which abounds in conjectures and controversies.

The famous American anthropologist, Margaret Mead, as pointed out by Krug, has shown in several instances a unique and unifying feature shared by history and anthropology: the loving preservation of detail. Mead says:

> historians and anthropologists have been distinguished from one another by the materials which they have studied: the historian dealing with past periods and the anthropologist with primitive peoples. This distinction is fast becoming obsolete, as both are turning their attention to contemporary problems of the great civilizations of the world.

HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY

The definitions: "History is contemplation based upon sources," and "All history is a history of thought," by Jacob Burckhardt and R. G. Collingwood respectively, must have been intended for the instructor of philosophy who in his deliberations within the classroom (and without) would prove that history is the footstool of philosophy.

An historian starts his inquiry basically with three questions: What happened? How did it happen? Why did it happen? History also seeks into the ultimate causes of things, although to a lesser degree. This is where philosophy comes in. History makes it possible for puzzled, bewildered men to contemplate their relationship with the past and bear the uncertain future with greater ease.

The study of the historical record, with its repeated, if not orderly, patterns of successes and failures, progress and regression, periods of brilliance followed by chaos and decline, contributes to a sense of the unity and common destiny of all mankind.

Immanuel Kant's *Idea of a Universal History* (1784) is an eloquent disquisition on the destiny of mankind and on the faith of the author in the idea of progress in history. To Kant, history was a constant progress towards rationality. The basic nature of man which is ruled by reason will eventually prevail. This German philosopher says:

> All tendencies of any creature to which it is predisposed by nature are destined in the end to develop themselves perfectly and agreeably to their final purpose.

Consequently, man's essentially rational nature will assert itself in the end and history will be richer with improved behavioral strategies.

A story was told at the University of Koenigsberg, where Kant taught philosophy, that when a student once pointed out that Kant had used some historical facts to support a particular philosophical theory, which upon examination proved to have been inaccurate, Kant allegedly replied, "Desto schlimmer fur die tatsachen" (so much the worse for the facts).

Hegel's *Philosophy of History*, according to Krug, had a profound influence on the philosphy of history. It created a whole school of historians who followed Hegel's theory in maintaining that all history is the history of thought and that every epoch was inspired and dominated by one idea.

CONCLUSION

How important is this discussion about the relationship between history and the other academic disciplines for the social studies teacher?

First, the growing rapport and the meaningful collaboration between history and other disciplines have become brighter because historians have become less dogmatic about their refusal to make generalizations, and social scientists have generally become wary about exaggerating the value of empirical data.

Second, historians in an increasing number have become convinced that the use of social science concepts like status, social mobility, consensus and cultural change are of great value in achieving better understanding of an historical event or a personality.

Third, the increasing complexity of our society and the constant dangers to its survival are turning the attention of historians and social scientists to contemporary problems.

Myth, Ideology, and History*

Jules de Raedt

WE ALL LIKE THE WORD "progress" and we all respect the word "science", but one aspect is to appreciate and another is to practice. Feelings are often mere dreams and aspirations are not productions. Progress is not something that comes to us through creation or—as we say in legal terms—through an act of God, like a typhoon. Progress is man-made. And this reminds me of a story once told by ex-Secretary of Education, Alejandro Roces. The story went more or less like this:

When God created the world, the Filipinos came to Him and asked that He give them a good country. "All right," said God, "you may give your own specifications." First, they asked for a good climate. It was immediately granted. Then, they asked that their country be rich in mineral resources. "You will have that," answered God. Again, they asked for fertile soil. "It will be my pleasure," replied God, "even if you wet and plant your finger in the ground, it will have root." After receiving all that they had asked for, they finally requested, "Lord, could you also provide us with good leaders and politicians?" At that moment, the Lord's face turned to a less than benign expression. "I have given all you asked for," he said. "Good leaders and politicians, that you will also have to take care of yourselves. This is something *you* can do." And, there the story ends.

---

* Paper read in the Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at the Baguio Colleges, Baguio City, on May 26, 1972.

I told this story about politicians; first, because I do not know of a good one about history teachers; and second, because is so common nowadays to blame our politicians for everything. Now, teaching good history is also something we can do ourselves.

We can therefore raise the question: "How do we conduct our affairs effectively? How shall we go about with matters that are "our business"? How do we learn, teach and even make history for progress?" An answer to these questions starts with an understanding of the terms "learning" and "progress." Strangely, but fortunately, both can be clarified at the same time.

Becoming a full-fledged—that is, effective—member of a society is achieved through a process which can be referred to as education in its broadest sense. Other terms used more frequently in the social sciences are socialization (in sociology) and acculturation (in anthropology). Both have a traditional ring into them, insofar as they seem to suggest that the school's role merely consists in transmitting a fixed tradition and helping the young to find their place in the existing social framework; and as if the individual's maturity consisted mainly in his psychological and emotional adjustment to the status quo.

Such as understanding of the role of the school is no longer acceptable. We now view this as the transmission as well as the shaping of the culture of the community it serves—without, of course, falling into the anti-intellectualist extreme of those who claim that such schools should be actively involved in current social issues rather than be academic institutions.

I intend, therefore, to present a few thoughts on the school as an agent of culture. When I said that the school is called to play an active role in the transmission and shaping of culture, this double meaning of "enculturation" was intended, for we live in times of world-wide transition. In earlier days, the good life was nothing more than the traditional beliefs. The role of education was to teach these beliefs. In our changing times these roles are no longer so clear. We now must educate for a future that will be different from the present. After a brief outline of the nature of this transition, I propose to review our stereotype notions about method or the teaching-learning process, which may help us shape the right questions with regard to the problem of curriculum and course content, and end with what I believe are the chief characteristics of modern history making and the modern historian.

A NEW WORLD

Nowadays, I said, we live in a transitional society. That description applies world-wide. Each country is in some stage of transformation from a traditional way of life to a modern one—from stagnant to progressive. Since no single country would claim disinterest in modernization and industrialization, we ask ourselves, "What has brought it about and what is its driving force?"

The main agent of our present transformation is science. It is a new outlook on life that never existed before or at least only in embryonic form. It is a shift from traditionalism to modernism, from authoritarianism to originality, from imitation to innovation, from repetition to reconstruction, from rhetoric to involvement, and from conventional wisdom to science. It is a new perspective; instead of emphasizing dependence on the past, it constructs for the future. Progress, as the word itself implies, does not come through with more of the same, but only through outright change; and learning is not merely a process of ordinary passive mentation, properly referred to as spoon-feeding. A scientific attitude is a critical, inquisitive attitude.

What I am referring here is a cultural change. This is a different way of viewing the world, which calls for a new criterion of teaching and learning, with the purpose of changing that world. In educational curricula, most of the emphasis goes to method, with little time for content. Progressive education has slid into an exclusive dependence on an elaborate system of psychological approaches and a proliferation of mechanical teaching aids; and has lost sight of what was really intended—the introduction of a new angle of seeing things, which is the basis of real learning for contemporary life. My dismay is not with the fact that psychology is taught and consulted for the sake of raising the efficiency of teaching and learning but that the cultural aspect of education which is as important, if not more so in our fast changing times, is neglected.

Man was the maker of his culture in the past as in the present, but this was not recognized. With the modern insight that man is the creator of his models in life as much as he is shaped by them, we have a new ball-game with respect to the problem of the curriculum as well as the teaching-learning process.

THE PROBLEM OF THE CURRICULUM

Many different attempts have recently been made to create a more adequate design for the subject matter that should enter into the curriculum of each major level of education—elementary, secondary, higher. Innumerable proposals to attain a more effective "general" education on the high school and college level, for example, have been argued pro and con; some have been tried out. Yet, it is only too apparent that educators still have a great deal of trouble achieving any kind of general agreement as to the best conception for unifying the great array of subject matter. Some borrow their models from the natural sciences. Others seem to think that general education is best achieved through the great books of all times. Others also argue that the central obligation of education should be "self-actualization" or "fulfillment." By this, they mean optimum expression of the personality—emotional, intellectual and physical. The development of any subject matter, such as art or science, and the development of any skill, such as language or mathematics, ultimately become sanctioned in the degree that each subject matter and each skill contribute directly and indirectly to the maximum fulfillment of the human personality.

The intention to stimulate initiative in the learner, and the learning itself, is a laudable one. But as theory, it appears to be too narrowly limited to the individual. There is undue, exclusive, emphasis on the psychology of the individual. The family, school and even the nation are also capable of moving toward greater realization of their own characteristic powers, although and always, in reciprocal relation with its individual members. In other words, culture—that is, culture shared with others—is an important ingredient of personality, if not the most important one. This suggests that it might be more fruitful to evaluate problem of the curriculum in terms of culture, and more specifically in terms of cultural transition.

Depending on one's basic beliefs, either as a traditionalist or modernist (the two do not mix), even after giving due consideration to the vocational and professional objective of the school or of the curriculum, there will be variations not only in the composition of the curriculum but also—and most important—in the manner the courses are taught; "Method" then no longer means, in the first place, the teaching procedures and classroom techniques which psychology advices or berates, but the unspoken understanding of the modern meaning of enculturation which the teacher carries and the school propagates.

I have a hunch that it is partly because of this latter problem that the more empirical problem of the composition of the curriculum, even single courses, is not and cannot be resolved as of now. In our own society, it is neither a matter of teaching more science subjects nor of spending an inordinate amount of time in the discussion of current events.

But let us look directly at the teaching of history as an appropriate example. Traditional courses of history, even if they do not do violence to the historic truth, are commonly sterile and unmotivated sequences of facts and events. Actually, there is no good reason why they cannot become a vital part of the curriculum, particularly if reorganized with the resources of cultural history and, consequently, if taught as a *social* science. Such a perspective in its teaching should provide with meaningful unity and immense relevance for our fascinating age. History teachers have only themselves or their tutors to blame, if the students are bored and if they (the teachers) become the chief perpetuators of learning by memorization.

Any instructor who approaches the idea of culture seriously and responsibly will in the course of time become a very different teacher than he would otherwise be. In some cases, the integrating effect will occur months, even years later. But when it does, the school too will begin to undergo transformation. Every school in a genuine sense is the creation of its operators. One important reason why good schools develop at all is because good teachers want them to be. Dedication is not just a moral attitude. It is based on certain convictions—a world view. A thorough understanding of the transition we are in and of the need for a transformation is a prerequisite to every step of accomplishment.

THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS

To further clarify the point, let me comment briefly on the teaching-learning process as redefined in our present age.

The traditionalist presupposes a psychology of learning epitomized in such terms as "passive mentation" or "tacit learning", while the modernist takes a more systematic approach through acquiring a learning which involves active and critical transactions with the cultural and other fields of experience.

The traditionalist theory takes some of its force from the fact that cultural patterns are exceedingly "tough"—that is, powerful not only in their control over the habits and attitudes of people but also in their resistance to deliberate modification. Any kind of effective education consequently needs an assessment with maximum clarity and honesty of the stubborn obstacles that stand in the way of effecting any planned change in existing customs, habits, mores, i.e., in the inherited culture. Many perplexities and frustrations on the part of teachers can be avoided by recognizing this. The fact that the personality of every learner is heavily influenced by the general cultural patterns does not justify the teacher's first responsibility to help children adjust to such an order, for the spurious sake of "well-adjusted personalities."

In the modernist view, the teacher's role is recognizing as sensitively as possible the influence of culture upon learners while at the same time encouraging them to the utmost to develop skills and habits of creative modification. Hence, the further need of the teacher is to understand the culture and the specific problems of the students on account of their cultural inheritance.

In primitive societies, the initiation rites with their crash program of instruction in the traditional beliefs and mores are miniature schools. They are effective means of internationalization of an inherited way of life that, as far as the adult members of the community know, has remained unchanged since the "beginnings" and was handed down by the gods. Our schools cannot imitate such a pattern of instruction. Actually, all cultures do change, though not frequently in the rapid and drastic ways we observe today; and when there have been sudden fundamental changes before, the record of those events is lost and the process is forgotten. Hence, the impression of the illiterates that their culture does not and should not change, and of the literates that history is on their side in support of the same contention.

The attitude of innovation, when consciously and deliberately developed by the teacher within a cultural matrix, influences the learner if within, only by the contagion of the teacher's attitude. Methods of teaching thus means something far more than what is offered by psychological theory. The latter's advice is most valuable and indispensable, but limited by the self-imposed boundaries of the discipline. The enculturative process defined merely as passive mentation and the acquisition of skills is likewise superseded by analysis, criticism, originality and participation, with all the modifications in learning and teaching that these processes imply.

The search for truth through education is surely a high responsibility. It is differently conceived by the two cultures. For the traditionalist, because truth is already embodied in the nature of the universe and culture, the chief task of the school is to place the learner in a position of receptivity and then to see to it that he acquires as much truth as he possibly can by direct exposure. For the modernist, truth is not already present, awaiting disclosure; it is always in the making, always unfinished, always subject to correction as learners engage in further interaction with their natural and human environment. Such a process of attaining truth invites ceaseless search for more accurate and fruitful ways of understanding and directing human and physical experience.

My intention in the foregoing paragraphs is not to suggest that teachers individually embark on some adventurous—and possibly erratic manner of presenting the subject matter, or not presenting it at all by leaving to the student what he wishes to accept or reject. Perhaps the most practical service of this view of truth-seeking would be a more problem-oriented approach in teaching. Students are not served well if the teacher cannot give proof of an awareness of the existence of "loose ends"—that is, unresolved problems which the best present theory cannot handle. Theory, like culture, is a model, and always temporary until a better one that can resolve more problems is suggested, including those unearthed by the application of the present state of hypothesis-making. Teaching students with the impression of finality, by keeping them unaware of the unresolved questions with which their discipline is still struggling, has double effect—that their motivation for learning is stifled and that their term papers and theses are either uncritical and unthinking copies of some existing material, or simply irrelevant. A thesis, particularly, is an intellectual product typically stimulated by an awareness of real problem. The handling of a worthwhile problem can only result from a method of instruction as here suggested. The frequent inability of students to either start or finish a decent thesis in my opinion can be directly caused by a defective method of instruction which is handed down from the teacher to the student. The best course in methods of research cannot make up for it and may even prove unnecessary for most of the sciences if during their course work, both in the classroom and in their readings, the students have not come in contact with real problems; and how they are tackled.

The foregoing paragraphs were written with graduate students in mind. Some of your pupils and students will one day be graduate students, for it is not a piece of rhetoric to say that potentially good minds attend barrio schools as well as university laboratory schools. What I have to say about term paper and thesis writing applies with equal force to the tackling of daily problems. If a child has learned to approach the subject matter as a problem to be solved, if it has gotten from the teacher an impression that life is a problem to be solved and that the traditional solutions are not necessarily effective, the youth will enter life with an attitude of a problem solver and not one as a habitual relier upon someone. Whether he be a farmer or a janitor, he will have initiative. In other words, he will really find his place in society. Our changing society needs problem solvers, doers.

There is therefore more to Dewey's theory of learning—that is, acquiring through inquiring—than what the Progressive Education Movement has made of it. The movement has died a natural death because of its shallowness and superficial interpretation of Dewey's philosophy. It limited itself to a translation of classroom techniques and overlooked the more penetrating questions raised by Dewey. They thus unknowingly kept catering to a traditional view of the role of education. After all, Dewey's educational theories are but an articulate expression of the scientific approach that has progressively established itself during the last few centuries.

Today, the school, as an agent of culture, is a medium of change, not only in the new skills it teaches or the new courses it offers, but also in the attitude it creates in the students. That attitude must first of all be present in the educational leaders: the administration and faculty.

You might say, now, what does all this has to do with the teaching of history? So far, I have said little about history. It is not necessary, for my aim is to create the background against which the teaching of history should be viewed. I want to present this like the rest of the educational process, as a cultural activity. History itself is the record of a cultural tradition and change. The events related are meaningless if the story does not tell us why they occurred and where led to, and how. With a fair understanding of modernization as a cultural and necessary event, the teacher will look at history as a record of successes and failures; and make the learners more aware of its relevance.

THE MAKING OF HISTORY

In the preceding, I have often stressed the influence of science on our modern culture. I now want to mention what I understand in writing history, by being a historian. History instructors are not just teachers—people who learned something about the mechanics of lesson plans, motivation and whatnot; they are also historians. They may not exactly make history, but they share the historical view of those who write it. Now, what is this historical view?

History and science have often been radically opposed to each other. Yet, they have something in common. Both are fundamentally explanatory in intent. They erect models of reality. In this sense, they have a family resemblance. Like science, the historical view is a step away from flat-footed common sense. Unlike pure science, which we find only in societies influenced by modern intellectual tradition that gave birth to it (and which it sustains in turn), it is fairly universal to account for an event by recounting how it came to be. And, like most other cultural perspectives (such as art, religion, law and common sense), it is older than the written word.

Various genres of oral literature have been drawn up to see if those people who do not possess writing have a true sense of time. The most famous distinction, offered by Malinowski,[1] mention three genres: myth, legend and fairy tale. Myths are sacred and true; legends are sacred but not true; fairly tales are neither sacred nor true. This classification excludes the historical view completely. But people also tell stories that are meant to be true in a historical sense, apart from those stories that are held to be true, because of their religious-philosophical content. The Tikopia, a Polynesian people in the Western Pacific, make three distinctions in their event-sequence material:[2]

---

[1] "Myth in Primitive Psychology," in Bronislaw Malinowski, *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays,* p. 93 ff.

1. *Taranga* or stories about village affairs going back two or three generations. These stories do not have a particular form and always refer to the recent past.

2. *Tara tupua* or specific items of traditional information. These tales are about ancient or venerable matters, e.g., short accounts of an incident or about culture heroes. Not all are sacred but all are serious matters and always refer to the remote past.

3. *Kai* or set narrative forms of story telling, related in a timeless context. They include the sacred kai, e.g., cosmological myths and genealogical material.

Leaving the Tikopian categorization of tales, we can detect three stages in their history as reflected in their oral traditions:

1. Those stories that reach back about ten generations from the present. They are systematic accounts about which there is general agreement as to the facts and meaning.

2. Tales whose historicity are not measurable in genealogical terms. The people is supposed to know what have happened in general, but the details are debatable and there is a mixture of human and divine.

3. Tales about the genuine "dream time" which are primarily the relationship between the Tikopia and the gods and the beginning of Tikopia time.

We see basically two perspective emerging from this material, suggesting a more fruitful distinction, that between myth and history and between myth and legend (the latter term representing the historical orientation). The views of reality embodied in these tales belong to two different manners and realms of "knowing" and "seeing."

Myth is pure making and is believed because of the contents in ultimate statements about reality. History, on the contrary, is making and matching, which depends for its acceptability upon matching: did it really happen like that? Both myth and history explain the present. Myth does it by offering a paradigm. Its view of reality is all-embracing and offers a fundamental explanation for the present state of affairs in a non-specific relationship. It explains all on an ultimate level. The events related in myths occurred *in illo tempore* (or, as the Australian aborigines say, in the "dream time"). There is a time gap between these primordial events and current events. The explanation is not sequential but paradigmatic.

---

[2] Raymond Firth, *History and Traditions of Tikopia* (Humanities).

Legends, on the other hand, communicate time-bound and concrete facts. The current state of affairs, a concrete situation taken from the general flow of life, is explained through a chain of preceding events. Legends make sense out of the present by referring to a temporal continuity, through a sense of historical time. Like myth, history too is making. It offers an explanation through the selection of events that appears to explain the present. It tries to match antecedent events with contemporary which are felt as forming the historical chain that brought them about.

In both myth and history we find, therefore, the element of making. Both are theories or models, but only in history do we find the element of matching, the search for time-bound, concrete facts. This distinguishes historical from mythological explanations. The "dream time" stories refer to timeless events, telling us how man came to be what he is. Neither time nor history are involved here. The time it speaks of is also part of the present. It was and it is.

When reading the Old Testament, for example, we notice a transition from the first few chapters of Genesis, through the genealogies and legends about the Patriarchs and Judges, until we reach the chronicle of events during the period of the Kings. The Chronicles and the other later Historical Books about recent events and were accepted on the basis of their factuality, while the earlier "historical" books document remote events as related by oral tradition whose details are debatable. The Jewish literati who initiated the putting on paper of the Jewish oral traditions during the kingdom wrote from a historical perspective. In their preoccupation with fact, they sometimes awkwardly mixed two or three oral traditions into a single story. The genealogies were meant to provide the hisrical link between these three stages of their history making.

The Old Testament thus provides us with an unintended document of a transition from a predominantly mythological to a predominantly historical tradition.

Generally, in my remarks on education I accused the educators of sliding back into a narrow psychological view of the business of educating. Here I must address my plea to the historians, that they in turn may not slide back into a mythological perspective when making history. Like all sciences, history is made by matching fact with theory. It is expected that our theories or explanations of facts change as we move on, and that what is considered as significant fact today may not be so tomorrow. All this is part of the development of any scientific theory. I am addressing myself, however, to less subtle things. I cannot see, for example, what is to be gained from telling an American child that Abraham Lincoln never told a lie, or from presenting similar moralizing tales about an imaginary *bayanihan* spirit of the early Filipino people. It may help the child to be told about certain ideal personalities or situations, although one doubts sometimes if that is really necessary, but these models can also be found elsewhere—in mythological tales which, by their very form, the child understand to be just that, myths.

In the same manner, and this is a more imminent danger today, it would in my opinion be wrong to color the historical record with political or economic ideology. History is a social science; ideology is not a science, although like history, it is also an imaginative work, a theory of social events. "Science names the structure of situations in such a way that the attitude contained toward them is one of disinterestedness. Its style is restrained, spare, resolutely, analytic: By shunning the semantic devices that most effectively formulate moral sentiment, it seeks to maximize intellectual clarity. But ideology names the structure of the situation in such a way that the attitude toward them is one of commitment. Its style is ornate, vivid, deliberately suggestive: By objectifying moral sentiment through the same devices that science shuns, it seeks to motivate action. Both are concerned with the definition of a problematic situation and are responses to a felt need of needed information. But the information needed is quite different, even in cases where the situation is the same. An ideologist is no more a poor social scientist than a social scientist is a poor ideologist. The two are—or at least ought to be—in quite different lines of work, lines so different that little is gained and much obscured by measuring the activities of the one against the aims of the other.

> Where science is the diagnostic, the critical, dimension of culture, ideology is the justificatory, the apologetic, one . . . . That there is a natural tendency for the two to clash, particularly when they are directed to the interpretation of the same range of situations, is thus clear; but that the clash is inevitable and that the findings of (social) science necessarily will undermine the validity of the beliefs and values that ideology has chosen to defend and propagate seem most dubious assumptions. An attitude at once critical and apologetic toward the same situation is no intrinsic contradiction in terms (however often it may in fact turn out to be an empirical one) but one sign of a certain level of intellectual sophistication . . .
>
> Ideologies do make empirical claims about the condition and direction of society, which it is the business of science (and, where scientific knowledge is lacking, of common sense) to assess. The social function of science *vis-a-vis* ideologies is first to understand them—and second to criticize them, to force them to come to terms with (but not necessarily surrender to) reality. The existence of a vital tradition of scientific analysis of social issues is one of the most effective guarantees against ideological extremism, for it provides an incomparably reliable source of positive knowledge for the political imagination to work with and to honor. It is not the only such check. The existence . . . of competing ideologies carried by other powerful groups in the society is at least as important; as is a liberal political system in which dreams of total power are obvious fantasies; as are stable social conditions in which conventional expectations are not continually frustrated and conventional ideas radically incompetent. But, committed with a quiet intransigence to a vision of its own, it is perhaps the most indomitable.[3]

In conclusion, let me emphasize again that progress can be attained only by an increasing application of science to our life problems not by merely borrowing results obtained elsewhere but by its application in all fields, including history: its making *and* teaching. Modernization is a cultural event in which the academic field of history plays a vital role. Its proper teaching is equally important as in mathematics; and its scientific aims should never become obscured (nor its cultural benefits undermined by the anti-intellectualist attitudes often encountered in either the mythically or ideologically inclined.)

---

[3] Clifford Geertz, "Ideology as a Cultural System," in David E. Apter, Ed., *Ideology and Discontent* (The Free Press), pp. 71-73.

The Philosophy of History *

James D. Skerry, S.V.D.

TWO BRANCHES of philosophy address themselves to the problems of history: epistemology and metaphysics. Epistemology is the branch of philosophy which treats of man's way of knowing or how man comes to knowledge. In regard to history, epistemology asks the question of how a historian arrives at a significant account of man's recorded past. Metaphysics is the branch of philosophy which deals with essences of things, the study of ultimate meanings. In regard to history, metaphysics asks the question of the ultimate meaning, purpose or goal of history. Such works as Chardin's speculation on the evolution of man toward a noosphere, or Marxian historical concept of materialism, or Toynbee's study of 20 civilizations are all historical works which would be described as metaphysical. Fascinating as these studies are, they are not the subject of this lecture on the philosophy of history.

Under consideration this morning are some areas of epistemology. The lecture series so far, because of the overlapping of subject matters, has already touched on many topics which fall under the general title of critical history or the epistemology of history. Lectures on the "Study of History," "History as a Social Science," and "Interpretation in History" are

---

* Lecture delivered in the 1973 Lecture Series on History of the National Historical Commission and the Philippine Historical Association at the University of San Carlos, Cebu City, on September 22, 1973.

examples.

At the risk of repeating material, this lecture goes over some of the same grounds briefly, sketchily, even superficially to arrive at some pragmatic schoolmasterish local applications for the teaching of the study of history in the New Society, the training of professional historians, and the need to assemble and study even more deeply the basic data with which the historians work.

Let us approach the subject from an example, the accumulation of records in the office of school administrators over the period of 25 years. These records are a kitchen midden of raw data: teacher's contracts and teaching schedules, lists of students and faculty members, everything from letters of application for teaching positions to faculty ranking, policies developed and policies aborted, routine correspondence sent and received, copies of correspondence between other persons, and so on, and so on.

Putting this mass of circumscribed raw data in another century, a series of questions comes to mind. Is this raw data history? No, no more than "everything one person learned yesterday"; nor a telephone directory is history, since despite all controversies on the nature of history all agree that history is an organized body of knowledge. Further questions then arise: Who then is qualified to turn this mass of raw data into history—into a significant account of man's recorded past? What qualifies him to turn raw data into an organized body of knowledge? What methods does he use What is his justification for using them? How does he decide what is significant or important and what is not? What is his justification for using the criteria or standards which he uses?

Traditionally, using insight and imagination and experience, historians in a basically literary fashion reduced the subject matter to coherence. Today, using the natural and social sciences as a model, history uses inductive methods involving the following steps:

(1) The observation of a sufficient number of facts or data;

(2) Then, there follows a speculation about reality, a consideration of the possible relationship between these observa-

tions of facts and the formulation of a hypothesis or theory.

Then follows a test of the speculation or hypothesis or theory against a new set of data.

In the natural and social sciences the test of a good hypothesis or theory is not so much whether it is true as whether it is useful in ordering facts and generating new hypotheses.

The procedure is much like the art of an investigator in a detective story: reconstruction of the crime and investigation of whether all the facts correspond to the theory. What characterizes the scientific method is the process and technique used to investigate in a systematic way to arrive at certain conclusions.

The professional study of history has its own characteristic methods of investigating facts and events of the past; of formulating hypotheses and testing them and arriving at interpretations of man's recorded past in order to give a significant account of them.

The peculiar problems of historical study arise from the fact that historical theories are based upon specific and individual occurrences in the past, a problem touched upon by Mr. Lucero in his discussion of history as a social science. The historian must strive for impartiality and objectivity in his work, avoiding propaganda on one hand and lack "point of view" on the other. While avoiding personal biases (personal likes and dislikes) and prejudices (unaware assumptions of the group to which he belongs), he must adopt one of several competing theories and understand that basically different moral beliefs (for instance, on the nature of man) lead to the different conclusions about the "facts of history", for example in the Catholic and Protestant interpretation of the Reformation.

What all this leads to is the statement that a study of history is a professional undertaking, whose success eventually can be judged only by other historians. Unfortunately, everyone knows something about history and many non-historians are willing to undertake the task of writing history, despite the fact that "not every fool can write it" (Walsh, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of History*). Somewhat the same situation prevails in other social sciences. For instance, psychology. As a clinical psychologist one is often dismayed to find amateurs with minimal professional training undertaking the administration and interpretation of psychological tests for diagnostic counselling purposes. To guard the public against charlatans and quacks, professional psychologists, like physicians, have tried to set up licensing bodies. Unfortunately, historians are not in a position to do likewise. But in some ways historians need to stake out a claim on their field and methods.

The complaint has been aired that historians in the Philippines have made "no sustained effort." Perhaps this is because non-historians have felt free to write history as historians in the boundaries of history that have not been sufficiently delineated. Let us use three current examples:

1. The President's mandate to historians to study the prehistoric movement of people into the Philippines;
2. Fr. Hutterer's recent study on archaeology in Cebu City;
3. The officers of the Cebu Historical Association.

Practical implications for the teaching and study of history:

1. Education in concept rather than memorizing facts for students;
2. The need to train future historians in the use of historical tools by having them study the methods even more than the subject matter of their texts;
3. The need for graduate students in history to use primary sources, or raw data in their apprentice work as graduate students.

The availability of primary sources and the need to tap them is the second major point of practical import that I would like to indicate. One example: The close association of religious and political developments in the Philippines and the participation of the clergy in these events is familiar to all. Every school boy knows of Gom-Bur-Za as national heroes. Perhaps, however, the religious history of revolution has not yet been written since primary sources in this regard have not been tapped. Let me cite some examples:

1. Only recently the archives of Archbishop Cuenco of Jaro have become available, a rich source of Filipiniana consisting of books, newspapers and original documents.

2. The Vincentian Fathers of Adamson University, who at one time operated almost every major seminary in the past, are in a possession of a large collection of bundles of documents as yet unlisted or annotated pertaining to the administration of seminaries all over the Philippines, with biographical data of every student who entered and left the seminary; they are now opening these archives to researchers.

3. The archives of the Archdiocese of Manila of which the Archdiocese of Cebu was once a part have never been opened for historical purposes even though they contain the basic documentation on priests, regular and secular, for several centuries;

4. Much the same can be said of the Dominican archives at UST;

5. Many parishes here in the south still have parish records going back for centuries pertaining to parish and municipality, raw data for the social and political development of Filipino people (*padron*, or *estado de alma*), have mostly remained unused. Much has been done, but much remains to be done. There is God's plenty for all.

Philippine Local History; A Brief Bibliographical Survey *

Marcelino A. Foronda

LOVE OF A COUNTRY or a nation does not obviate nor does it obliterate love of a town, province, or region. On the contrary, one who does not love his own town, province, or region—or the traditions intimately intertwined with the historical development of that town, province, or region will find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to love a larger—and even more mythical—body politic known as a nation.

Indeed, if one is to have a more perceptive, a more complete, and therefore, a much more genuine love of the Philippine nation, it is inescapable that he should first of all love his own town, province, or region. One complements the other. Far from fostering regionalism, we may say that if one is to understand, and consequently to appreciate the complex entity that is Philippine history, tradition and culture, it is inevitable that he should first of all know the history, tradition, and culture of his own town, not to say his province or region, that form part, as it were, of the much larger mosaic that we now call the Philippine experience.

---

* Paper read in the Regional Seminar on History of the National Historical Commission at Silliman University, Dumaguete City, on January 23, 1972.

In truth, we may never achieve a fuller understanding of the Philippines and of the Filipinos if we fail to study the history of our towns, and our provinces. And it is this history of our towns, provinces, and regions that we call local history, to distinguish it from general, national or universal history.

Father Horacio de la Costa has once remarked that Philippine Historiography is relatively poor in regional and municipal histories, and that this lack leaves notable gaps in our knowledge which the more pretentious accounts are unable to fill.

In a sense Father de la Costa is right. For in the past local history has not merited the attention not to say the dedication and efforts of our more notable historians, relegated as it was by and large to souvenir programs of town fiestas and athletic meets, or to volumes commemorating the anniversaries of some city, town or province.

As might be expected such accounts are uneven in quality, and if they do share one thing in common it is that they do seem, at least the ones that I have read, to have been written with a minimum notion of historical methodology and scholarship.

This is not, of course, to minimize the importance of such efforts; the scholar may indeed use them, but with caution, in his reconstruction of certain aspects of Philippine history.

Yet the writing of local history in the Philippines is not actually new. Towards the late 1500's records of the establishment of some of our towns had already existed, and by the early 1600's Spanish friars, writing reports of their missionary activities, had included accounts of towns and settlements which they had founded within their jurisdiction. In a few instances, like the accounts of de la Concepción, Chirino, and Colin, not only the establishment of these early towns but also pre-colonial religions, customs, and traditions are narrated. But these accounts were written by non-Filipinos, who had different cultural orientations and contexts, and therefore are not always lacking in biases or prejudices.

It would only be towards practically the end of Spanish colonial rule, however, that the first book-length work in local history written by a Filipino, the *Historia de Ilocos* by Isabelo de los Reyes, was published in 1890. But de los Reyes, who had many interests other than local history, was not always exacting in his scholarship, and therefore this book, while it definitely paved the way for Filipino scholarship in local history, must be used with caution.

Other works on the history of our towns and provinces have been written, some of them before the second world war, and, as a result of the resurgence of nationalism, others were written during these past few years. But practically all these works were written by individuals who call themselves *aficionados* of history and this, among other reasons, might possibly be why these works never had an impact on Philippine historical scholarship.

Indeed, our professional historians, for their part, have chosen to write "general" Philippine history, which was taken to mean the political, social and cultural history of the country. It would only be after the war that some scholars—Filipino and foreign, many of whom were graduate students writing doctoral dissertations—veered away from "general" Philippine, not to say, textbook Philippine history, and have written and consequently published, diplomatic, political, military, administrative, and ecclesiastical history.

On the other hand, some continued to write on topics which have been reworked again and again to threadbare proportions in seemingly unending articles and monographs. Others published textbooks which are nothing but scissors-and-paste work, as critics not too kindly, if accurately, have pointed out.

All this, of course, is not meant to cast aspersion on our historians; it is merely mentioned in relation to the fact that local history in the Philippines still await the dedication of our first-rate historians who, with the exception of Dr. Domingo Abella, seem bent on keeping this aspect of our history a territory forever virgin—unnoticed, unwanted, and untouched.

Yet local history must be explored by our historians if there is to be a flowering and a fruition of the writing of our national history; if attempts to write more comprehensive historical accounts of our country are not to be aborted.

The writing of local history involves the same methodology, tools and discipline necessary in the writing of general history. Inasmuch as Dr. Gagelonia has discussed this topic, I shall forego discussing the writing of history except to say that the local historian, because his field is more limited than that of the general historian, is in a better position to examine in more detail the histories of our towns, provinces, or regions, something, which by the nature of his subject, the historian dealing with a broader field may not do.

I would also like to add at this point, as I have also pointed out elsewhere, that, without minimizing its intended importance, a major in history in some collegiate program need no longer be a guarantee that one can write history. What is important is that one has the dedication to write history. The would-be historian can by himself learn the tools and the methodology of history if only he would take the time and the effort to study them with enthusiasm and persistence. Even more important is the fact that the would-be historian should actually write history, and put into actual practice what he himself might have learned from the more formalized confines of a classroom or by himself. One should be comforted by the thought that among respected historians some, like the English Winston Churchill, the Spanish Salvador Madarriaga or the Filipino Domingo Abella, did not originally train as historians.

Again, I say this not to disparage our historians who were formally trained in the discipline of history, but to inspire those of us who did not major in history to try our hand in writing the history of our towns, provinces or regions.

At this juncture, I would like to suggest practical approaches to local history.

First of all, I would suggest the establishment of more local historical associations on the municipal, provincial, or even on the regional levels. The membership of such groups would better be left to the organizers themselves as they would be in a position to attract the best persons in their localities who share with them the same interests.

Such groups, however, should interest their members to gather data from parish, municipal and/or provincial archives; to collect memoirs and other writings of local heroes and outstanding citizens that are still available; and to record local folklore, customs and traditions. Oral history—or the recording of memoirs and recollections of senior citizens by the use of the tape-recorder or some such gadget—should also be encouraged.

Such groups should also be encouraged to hold regular meetings or seminars to acquaint members of the tools and methodology of the gathering and the preservation of historical data, and the presentation of such data in historical essays or monographs.

I might also suggest the establishment of centers such as those of the Baliwag Historical Society, and the Hiyas ng Bulakan, both in Bulacan; the center of Iloko Studies in Vigan, that of Igorot Studies in Sagada, Mt. Province; that of Samar-Leyte Studies in Tacloban; Bicol Studies in Naga; or that of Northern Luzon Studies in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya.

That such centers can significantly contribute to the study of local history goes without saying. Not only can they initiate studies on the history of their localities; they can also focus attention on their history by means of permanent, or occasional displays of documents and artifacts that are intimately related to such history. Indeed, the Hiyas ng Bulakan, earlier mentioned, may serve as a good model for such centers. Not only does this center have a resident director and permanent staff; its imposing building has its own lecture hall and its permanent museum. This has been made possible through the interest and the support of the provincial governor, and the provincial government, and of the Bulakeños themselves, and it is my hope that other provinces will follow the example of Bulakan.

Such centers may also help perpetuate the memory of local heroes and local historical events by initiating annual celebrations to honor them, and moving to name streets after them and, if warranted, even to erect monuments in their honor. Let Rizal, in his heavy European overcoat, brood over the fate of his country in our town plazas, but let him have for company a local hero—who may or may not necessarily be in a heavy overcoat.

Again, such centers will be of great service to Philippine historical scholarship if they publish checklists and bibliographies of their holdings; i.e., documents, published materials and artifacts relating to local history to bring them to the attention of interested scholars.

Equally important would be the publication of journals and occasional publications by these centers. Indeed, journals such as the *Ilocos Review* of Vigan, the *Samar-Leyte Studies* of Tacloban, the *Journal of Northern Luzon* of Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya, the *Abra Journal of History*, and the erstwhile *Mindanao Historical Journal* have been published. While the first three are not specifically devoted to the study of the local history, they have from time to time published articles on the history and culture of their regions. Some of these provincial journals have since died, however, and have been buried, and are now awaiting their resurrection by other dedicated and interested individuals.

I might suggest that these historical groups and centers sponsor contests on the writing of local history and, equally important, publish the winning entries. This has been done before, of course. I do know, for instance, that contests on the writing of the history of Caloocan and Marinduque, have been conducted a few years back. Up to this late, however, the prize-winning manuscripts still remain unpublished.

The National Historical Commission can lend its prestige by sponsoring these contests, on the one hand, and on the other, by awarding annual prizes—say the National Historical Commission Award for Local History—to outstanding local histories published during the year.

In all these activities, the regional colleges and universities will definitely play a leading role. Of the local historical groups mentioned above many are attached to colleges and universities, and the publications mentioned are actually financed by these institutions.

But such colleges and universities can play still another important role insofar as local history is concerned: indeed, they may incorporate in their curriculum a study of the history of the region. I was of the impression that this is already being done in a very few educational institutions, to name just one, the Ateneo de Naga.

Should this not be possible, inasmuch as the curriculum is already overburdened with so-called relevant subjects (taxation and land reform are already integrated in the curriculum, and, if some individuals would have their way, a course on tourism should also be included!) perhaps the study of local history can be incorporated in already existing subjects.

To be sure, if students in our schools find history tedious, it is because they find it so far removed from their own cultural contexts and personal experience. If our history courses, would have to be more meaningful, and therefore more exciting to our pupils, it is necessary that they should be enlivened by references to events that happened near their homes.

For instance, the teacher of history in Vigan, and this refers to teachers of history on all levels, might bring his students to the birthplace of Burgos, or where Diego Silang was hanged. Such visits could occasion a discussion not only on the life of Burgos and of Diego Silang, but also on the forces—remote and proximate, economic, social, political, cultural and religious—that brought into the Philippine historical scene a Burgos or a Diego Silang. And in order to bring about an even more meaningful study of local history the teacher might relate these facts to contemporary events, like the more recent developments of nationalism in our country today.

While it must be granted that Burgos and Silang have ceased to be only local historical figures, it must be pointed out that certainly most other towns, provinces and regions in the Philippines, are not lacking either in local heroes or local historical spots. If the history teacher uses his imagination, the teaching of local history—even if only in relation to general Philippine history—need not be a monotonous recitation of names and dates; by bringing his pupils to where the action was, so to speak, the teacher makes more vivid and more alive historical figures and events, thus transformng them into real people and familiar scenes.

The role of local history, would be first of all to arouse among ourselves pride in our locality—our town, province or region—but it is pride limited neither by narrow provincialism nor by short-sighted regionalism. On the contrary, such pride should help pave the way for love of country.

It is in this context that local history will help contribute to the definition of the *alma filipina*, or, if one is more nationalistic about it, the *diwang Pilipino*; each history of our towns, provinces, or regions, providing minute, but nevertheless significant, pieces to the much larger mosaic that is the Philippine social, economic, cultural, political and historical experience.

Local history will thus bring about a better understanding of our country and among ourselves. Lack of understanding is oftentimes the result of a lack of knowledge of ourselves; knowing what the *diwang Pilipino* is—however abstract that might be in the beginning—we will necessarily know ourselves better.

Ultimately, with the pride, knowledge and understanding of the complex entity that *is* the Filipino, something generally misunderstood even by our own selves, we will hopefully, emerge with a conviction and faith in our destiny as a people, which will in time help provide guidelines by which we may pursue that destiny, however elusive it might seem.

Local history will thus have made us better Ilocanos, Negrenses, Tagalos, Cebuanos, Ilongos, Warays, Boholanos, and others, not only affectionately attached to a town, province, and region, but also intensely committed to that larger—even though more mythical body politic known as the Philippine nation, and everything for which it stands.

In this very significant sense, local history will have made us better Filipinos.

BRIEF BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY OF LOCAL HISTORY

To the interested student of local history, I suggest two articles which deal with the subject: H. P. R. Finberg, "Local History," in *Approaches to History*, edited by H. P. R. Finberg (London, 1965), pp. 111-125, and Perre Goubert, "Local History," in *Daedalus*, (Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (Winter, 1971), pp. 113-125. While these two articles do not specifically deal with Philippine local history, using as they do English and French local history as points of departure, they nevertheless treat of the subject as a distinct historical discipline, that is to say, as distinguished from universal, national, or general history. By tracing the origins and development of the study of local history in England and France, they advance insights and practical suggestions which are of great help to the local historian.

The *Outline of Philippine Local History and Folklore*, a 47-page mimeographed manual originally prepared by Severino I. Velasco in 1938 but was reissued by the Bureau of Public Libraries in 1963, is a detailed guide in the gathering and presentation of historical and folkloric data of our towns, cities, and provinces. This manual was circulated to municipal, city and provincial officials, required by President Manuel L. Quezon's Executive Order No. 138, dated January 3, 1938, to compile local histories and folklore. Such compilations were sent to the Bureau of Public Libraries and the Department of Education for safekeeping before the war. The student of Philippine local history might profit from a perusal of this manual.

In order to acquaint oneself with documents relating to Philippine local history and what has already been written and published on Philippine local history some bibliographies and listings might be useful. Alfredo T. Tiamson's *Mindanao-Sulu Bibliography* (Davao City, 1970) contains a listing of published materials, unpublished manuscripts, works-in-progress, and documents which a student of Mindanao and Sulu local history will find extremely useful. The same work also reprints in full Wenceslao E. Retana's earlier, but still useful, insofar as Spanish sources are concerned, *Bibliografía de Mindanao,* (1894).

Ifugao Bibliography by Harold C. Conklin published by Yale University (New Haven, 1968), while containing mostly ethnographic materials, also contains items which should be of interest to the local historian. This same observation may also apply to *Cordillera Bibliography* by William Henry Scott (Sagada, Mountain Province, 1970) published by the Igorot Study Center. This bibliography is an attempt to list all significant works on the ethnography and history of the present Mountain Province, Benguet, Ifugao and Apayao-Kalinga.

My own Iloko bibliography, now in the press, is a listing of published materials, a few documents, and Xerox copies of documents relating to the history and culture of the Ilokanos, and is meant to supplement Leopoldo Y. Yabes and José Resurrección Calip's "An Iloko Bibliography; containing works pertaining to the Iloko People and Their Language" [in Yabes' *A Brief Survey of Iloko Literature* (Manila, 1936), pp. 75-155]. While most of the entries included in the Yabes and Resurrección bibliography were either lost or destroyed during the last war, the items listed in my bibliography are presently found in our private collection.

Calendar of Philippine Documents in the Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library (Chicago, 1956), edited by Paul S. Lietz, lists 370 items, some of which relate to Philippine local history.

Augustinian Father Isacio Rodríguez's monumental *Historia de la Provincia Agustiniana del Smo. Nombre de Jesús de Filipinas* (Manila, 1965 —), the first four volumes of which are extensively annotated bibliographies, contains many items, both documentary and printed, which relate to the towns established by the Augustinians in many parts of the archipelago.

A listings of local history materials are found in *Catalogue of Filipiniana Materials in the López Memorial Museum,* the first volume of which was published in 1962. Subsequent volumes of the catalogue were published in 1965, 1967, and

1971. These catalogues make separate listings of the materials on local history found in the Lopéz Memorial Museum.

Aspects of Philippine local history have been the subject of graduate, and, at least in the case of De La Salle College, Manila, even undergraduate, theses in many of our colleges and universities. A listing and abstracts of those presented to the University of the Philippines may be found in the five-volume *Theses Abstracts* published by the U.P. Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (Diliman, 1962-1968?) which cover the periods, 1947-1954; 1954-1956; 1956-1959; 1960-1962; and 1963-1965.

Masteral and doctoral theses presented to the U.P. and other institutions, covering the period 1913-1962, which includes some studies on Philippine local history, are listed in *Compilation of Graduate Theses Prepared in the Philippines 1913-1962* (Manila, 1964?).

To be sure, other general and specialized bibliographies on Philippine local history have been published, but those mentioned above can be used as good starting points in a study of some aspects of Philippine local history.

The earliest accounts of Philippine local history were those of the early Spanish missionaries. The Franciscan Father Juan de la Concepción's *Historia General de Filipinas,* etc. (Manila, 1788-92) in fourteen volumes; the Dominican Father Diego Aduarte's *Historia de la Provincia del Sancto Rosario de la Orden de Predicadores en Filipinas, Iapon y China, etc.* (Manila, 1640); and the Jesuit Father Pedro Chirino's *Relación de las Islas Filipinas y de lo que han trabajado los Padres de la Compania de Jesús* (Rome, 1604), to name just three such accounts, include brief accounts of the establishment of missionary centers and towns within their jurisdiction.

Towards the second half of the seventeenth century, however, and possibly even earlier, histories of provincies and regions began to appear. Francisco Combes' *Historia de las islas de Mindanao, Iolo, y svs adyacentes, progressos de la religión, y armas católicas* (Madrid, 1667) is one of the most important books ever written on Mindanao and the nearby islands. More than two centuries later, this same book would be republished "with the collaboration of Father Pablo Pastells" in Madrid in 1897; it includes copious notes on personal names, places, animals, vegetables and peoples. Captain General Mariano Ricafort's *Reducción de Bohol* (Manila, 1830) includes historical sketches of the insurrections of that island in 1744-1829, while Francisco Gainza's *Memoria sobre Nueva Vizcaya* (Manila, 1849) contains much historical data about the province at that time.

In 1888 Adolfo Puya's *Filipinas, Descripción General de la Provincia de Bulacan* was published in Manila. In 1891 Camilo Millan's *Ilocos Norte, Descripción General de dicha Provincia* and Arturo Garin's *Cavite, Subic y Olongapo* were both published.

Before the Philippine revolution broke out Robustiano Echauz's *Apuntes de la Isla de Negros* (Manila, 1894), and Manuel Sastron's *Filipinas; pequeños estudios: Batangas y su Provincia* (Malabon, 1895) were also published.

The earliest book-length regional history written by a Filipino, however, seems to be *Historia de Ilocos* by Isabelo de los Reyes, published in Manila in 1890.

Najeeb M. Saleeby's *The History of Sulu* (Manila, 1908) is among the earliest local histories which came out during the American regime. Quite comprehensive, this book carries in its appendix documents concerning Mindanao, Palawan and Jolo. This same book was reissued in 1963 by the Filipiniana Book Guild in Manila. Later in 1923 Sixto Y. Orosa's *The Sulu Archipelago and its People* was published in New York, and is one of the pioneering studies on Mindanao written by a Filipino. Dr. Orosa's book, with an added supplement to update the earlier edition, was reissued in Manila in 1970.

Other works which were written during the Spanish regime, like Julian Malumbres's *Historia de Cagayan* (Manila, 1918), came off the press during this era. It was also this period that saw the publication of the writings of some of the participants of the Philippine revolution. Some, like Artemio Ricarte's memoirs, were translated into the vernacular, i.e.

Gubat dagiti Pilipino ken Kakastila, translated from the original Spanish into Iloko by León Pichay (Yokohama, 1929). Others, like *Inédita Crónica de la Guerra Americano-Pilipina en el Norte de Luzon, 1899-1901*, by Juan Villamor, who was a lieutenant colonel of the revolutionary army, were published for the first time. These works view the war in the light of regional, rather than national involvement, and, therefore, might be considered as local history.

As we all know, brief histories of our towns are generally included in souvenir programs published during town fiestas and athletic meets. Other more extensive histories are published in volumes commemorating important milestones of towns (i.e., *Tanay Tercentenary Souvenir, 1640-1940; The Towns of Rizal Province;* Manila, 1940), or of cities (i.e., Lourdes S. Mercado's *Cebu through the Centuries*; Cebu, 1965), or of provinces (i.e., *Camarines Norte: March 1919-1969: Golden Jubilee Year-book,* Daet, 1969) or of the centenaries of local heroes (i.e., *Ikasandaangtaon ni Hen. Makabulos; Bayani ng Tarlak,* 1871-1971, Tarlac, 1971). Such souvenir programs generally include historical data and materials on accounts on the leading families, the institutions, schools, products, and industries, in short, their agricultural, cultural, social, commercial and industrial progress.

It would seem, however, that it was only after the second world war that interest in our local histories became much more apparent.

Such interest is possible due to the resurgence of nationalism; and in our efforts to define our identity as a nation, many attempted to trace our historical and cultural roots by focusing on a town or province. Whatever might be the reason, the fact remains that in no other period of our history had so many Filipinos written books and monographs, of varying lengths, quality, and importance, on the history of our towns and provinces.

Of these studies for this brief survey, Dr. Domingo Abella's *Bikol Annals: a Collection of Vignettes of Philippine History,* Vol. I, (Manila, 1954) stands out as a model of solid scholarship. The result of many years of patient and painstaking research in Philippine, Spanish and Roman archives, this book will remain to be the standard work on Bikol regional history for many more years to come.

Mariano A. Henson's *A Brief History of the Town of Angeles in the Province of Pampanga, Philippines; from its Foundation in 1796 A. D. to the present 1947-1948* (San Fernando, Pampanga, 1947), is a slim booklet which attempts much more than what its 83 pages actually presents, and is sadly lacking in documentation. More of a chronology, it nevertheless contains data which a local historian can use with caution.

The Historical Conservation Society, headed by Atty. Alfonso Felix, Jr., has, among other praiseworthy projects, published *200 Years of Las Piñas* (Manila, 1962); *Majayjay (How a Town Came into Being*, including the Spanish original by Juan Palazon, and its English and Tagalog translations (Manila, 1964); and Leandro Tormo Sanz' *Lukban (A Town the Franciscans Built* (Manila, 1971), which was originally written in Spanish and translated into English by Antonio Serrano. While their presentation of data leaves much to be desired, these volumes are based on archival materials and are well-documented.

Francisco Calalang's *History of Bulacan* (Quezon City, 1971), while containing usable data, lacks documentation, and should therefore, be used with great care by the scholar.

Possibly the most attractively laid out local history book ever published in the Philippines is Rolando E. Villacorte's *Baliwag: Then and Now* (Caloocan City, 1970). Not only that, this well-researched book also contains a wealth of material about Baliwag, which are presented to the reader in highly readable English and Tagalog texts. Nevertheless the lack of adequate documentation and an index somewhat detracts from the importance of this work.

Muslim Philippines (Marawi City, 1968), edited by Antonio Isidro and Mamitua Saber, of the Mindanao State University, is a compilation of articles by the editors and four other writers, and deals with the historical background of the Moro problem, and the political, economic, health, medical, and educational problems of our Moslem brothers, and it should be of interest to students of Mindanao local history.

Eugenio C. Quesada's *Paete, Being an Informal Narration of the Life and Labors, Joys and Sufferings of the People,* (Manila, 1956) carries data about this Laguna town famous for its lanzones and wood-carvers in a highly personalized narrative.

Ed. de Rivera Castillet's *Cagayan Province and Her People* (Manila, 1960) is a ponderous and profusely illustrated, if unattractively laid out, and cluttered book, and contains data of the different towns, interesting people, including American oldtimers in Cagayan province.

These two books just mentioned, however, carry no documentation, thus minimizing their use for scholarly studies.

Documented and carrying a bibliography of unpublished and published materials and appendices of relevant material, is F. Delor Angeles's *Mindanao: The Story of an Island; A Preliminary Study* (Davao City, 1964), which however, fails to add new knowledge to the subject.

Francisco S. Tantuico, Jr.'s *Leyte: The Historic Islands* (Tacloban? 1964) draws mainly from printed sources, and its documentation leaves much to be desired. It is quite rich, however, in postwar data on the towns of the province.

Xavier University in Cagayan de Oro City published in 1968, *The Village; Early Cagayan de Oro in Legend and History,* compiled by Fr. Francisco Demetrio y Radaza, S. J., a work which is quite interesting for the ethnographic and historical materials that it contains.

Diokno R. Manlavi's *History of Palawan,* was published in 1970 and is an attempt to trace the history of this province from the time of the Spanish contact to the present. The approach, however, is popular, the style being vignette form, more than anything else.

Monographs of more specialized aspects of Philippine local history have also been published; to name just two: Teresita V. Benitez's *The Politics of Marawi* (Diliman, Quezon City, 1969) and Filemon M. Bautista's *The Philippine Revolution in Misamis Oriental* (Cagayan de Oro, 1968).

Some non-Filipinos have also written, and published, studies on Philippine local history in more recent years. Dominican Father Julio Gonzalez Alonso's *The Batanes Islands* was published in Manila in 1966; while S.V.D. Father Josef Schmitz's *Die Abra-Mission auf Nordluzon/Philippinen von 1598-1955* was published in Germany in 1964. Father Schmitz's work was later translated into English by Father John Vogelgesang as *The Abra Mission in Northern Luzon, Philippines, 1598-1955*, and was published in Manila in 1971. William Henry Scott's *On the Cordillera; a Look at the Peoples and Cultures of the Mountain Province*, a compilation of essays published here and abroad written by one of the most dedicated scholars studying Mountain Province history and culture, came off the press in Manila in 1966.

Possibly one of the earliest Philippine institutions of higher learning to include in its curriculum a study of regional history and culture is the Ateneo de Naga. Towards this and a textbook edited by Father James J. O'Brien, S. J., *The Cultural Heritage of the Bicol People*, was published by the school. This mimeographed textbook includes a general history of Bicolandia, and a history of the major Bicol towns, town fiesta dates, statistics in economics and population, and chapters on the Bicol language and orthography, songs and poetry, prayers and folk beliefs, proverbs, riddles and superstitions. Indeed, while its presentation stands much improvement, this textbook can serve as a model for other textbooks meant for the study of other regional histories.

Document

The Ford Report on the Situation in the Philippines *

I

To the President of the United States.

SIR:—I beg to submit the following report upon the situation in the Philippines:

INTRODUCTION

I arrived at Manila on March 14, 1913, accompanied by my son, J. Howard Ford, who acted as my Secretary. His knowledge of the Islands gained while in the Government Service, as a District Engineer, and his fluency in conversational Spanish, were of great use to me. As it was my plan to make a personal examination of conditions before seeking official information, we went first to San Fernando, the capital of Pampanga Province, where he was formally stationed. We remained there several days, spending the time in visiting provincial towns and meeting local officials, while awaiting supplies of clothing of local make for tropical wear. On returning to Manila, we embarked on an inter-island boat for a tour of the Island, lasting from March 20 to April 13, inclusive, extending as far south as Jolo and as far east as the Pacific Coast of Mindanao. Among the places visited were Cebu, Dumaguete, Zamboanga, Jolo, Cotabato, Parang, and Davao. Shortly after returning to Manila, we went to Baguio, the summer capital of the Island, remaining there from April 16, to May 6, inclusive. At Baguio, I obtained access to official records, which were open to me by the administrative chiefs, who were kind and generous in their assistance. I had also the advantage of meeting school teachers from all parts of the Islands as the annual assembly that is a valuable feature of the Baguio season, was then going on. Leaving Baguio on May 16, we made an automobile trip along the west coast of Northern Luzon, visiting all the important towns. On May 9, we took the train at Aringay, Union Province, and proceeded to Lucena in Tayabas Province, at which place we started upon another automobile trip extending to the Pacific Coast of Central Luzon. Returning to Manila on May 11, eight days were devoted to visits of inspection in that city and to automobile excursions in the suburbs. We left Manila on May 19, after having spent sixty-six days in investigation of conditions on the Islands.

---

* This report is the result of an investigation of Philippine conditions conducted by the author during a tour of the Islands from March 14 to May 19, 1913. It covers mainly the political and social condition then existing in the country, with emphasis on the former. Hitherto unpublished, the report is on file in the U.S. National Archives, Washington, D.C., where it forms part of its Record Group No. 350. The editors are grateful to Dr. Bonifacio S. Salamanca, Dean of the U.P. College in Manila for the loan of his xerox copy of the original report in the said Archives. — M. G.

Scope of the Investigation.

The Philippines in their various aspects offer a copious field for study and observation, and there is already in existence a large body of both scientific and popular literature dealing with the subject. The branch of the subject to which I directed my investigation was the political situation. I took for my starting point American policy in the Philippines, with the purpose of making an impartial examination of the results obtained. This policy was stated in the annual message of President McKinley to Congress on Dec. 3, 1900, in which the following account was given of instructions to the Philippine Commission:

> "In all the forms of government and administrative provisions which they are authorized to prescribe," the instructions read, "the commission should bear in mind

> that the government which they are establishing is designed not for the satisfaction or the expression of our theoretical views, but for the happiness, peace, and prosperity of the people of the Philippine Islands, and the measures adopted should be made to conform to their customs, their habits, and even their prejudices to the fullest extent consistent with the accomplishment of the indispensable requisites of just and effective government."

The practical interpretation of these instructions made by the Commission is thus set forth in their reports:

> "As to the general intellectual capacity of the Filipinos the commission is disposed to rate them high; but, excepting in a limited number of persons, these capacities have not been developed by education or experience. The mass of the people are uneducated. The intelligent public opinion on which popular government rests does not exist in the Philippines, and it cannot exist until education has elevated the masses, broadened their intellectual horizon and disciplined their faculty of judgment, and even then the power of self-government cannot be assumed without considerable previous training and experience under the guidance and tutelage of an enlightened and liberal sovereign power."
>
> "The general theory upon which the commission is proceeding is that the only possible method of instructing the Filipinos in methods of free institutions and self-government is to make a government partly of Americans and partly of Filipinos, giving the Americans the ultimate control for some time to come. . . . We have thought that by establishing a form of municipal government practically autonomous, with a limited electroate, and by subjecting its operations to the scrutiny and criticisms of a provincial government in which the controlling element is American we could gradually teach them the method of carrying on government according to American ideas."

With this statement of American policy as a basis, efforts to ascertain the results obtained were directed along these two main lines of inquiry:

1. Results of the system of popular education established by the Commission.

2. Results of the gradual initiation of the people in the practice of government according to American ideas.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

Character of the People.

Before discussing the situation in detail, it may be well to make some general remarks. It should be borne in mind that these remarks apply only to the Christianized Filipinos, numbering 6,987,686 according to the census of 1903. The pagan peoples, occupying mountain recesses, and the Moros, in the southern part of the Islands, will be separately considered.

The Filipinos are very different from any people of color with whom the people of the United States are acquainted. They are no more like negroes or Indians than are the Chinese or the Japanese. The use of the term "tribe" to designate the divisions that exist among them through difference in language is misleading since it may create the impression that their groupings are analogous to those of the American aborigines, albeit on a different plane of culture. The truth is that they are remarkably homogeneous in physique and culture, more so than is generally the case in a nation. The usual differences in style of living between the rich and educated and the poor and ignorant. are visible in every community, but, apart from language, there is nothing to distinguish one community from another as a different tribe or people. The Pampanga river is designated as the boundary between the Tagalogs and the Pampangans. One can see no more difference in the character of the people than would be the case on crossing the Delaware river between New Jersey and Pennsylvania. They are all one people and the same may be said of the rest of the so-called eight "civilized or Christian tribes."

No Tribal Divisions.

After forming this opinion from my own observations I looked into the literature of the subject to see what conclusions had been reached by scientific investigation. I found that in the monograph on population contributed to the Philippine census report published in 1905, Dr. David P. Barows declares:

> "One impression that has gained foothold in regard to the tribes of the Philippines I believe to be erroneous, and that is as to the number of distinct types or races and

> the multiplicity of tribes. Owing to the fact that nowhere in the Philippines do we encounter large political bodies or units, we have a superlative number of designations for what are practically identical peoples. The tribe itself as a body politic is unknown in this archipelago."

The institutional base of political organization has been not the tribe but the village community, and this remains a strongly marked characteristic. Rarely will one see an isolated homestead. Generally the houses of the people cluster together, even if it puts them at a considerable distance from their work. They frequently go out of the fields in troops and are habituated to concerted action. To such a pitch is this carried that one of a company of laborers may be assigned to duty in playing a guitar or a mandolin while the rest work, the music serving like a sailors' chanty to give a common periodic phase to their exertions.

As in their work so in their recreation the effect of habitual community is very marked, imparting vivacity and color to their social life, for parallels to which one must look to countries like China or Japan rather than to any Western nation.

Everywhere music abounds, played upon a great variety of stringed instruments. In the past a home-grown drama flourished but is now disappearing under the onset of the cinematograph, which seems to be getting into all the large towns. Here as elsewhere the cinematograph has developed its own class of subsidiary drama and the films reproduce some native dramas played by native actors.

Linguistic Diversity.

The intensity of community life characteristic of the Filipinos explains the linguistic diversity about which so much has been said. With the exception of some infiltration of foreign language at a few points, the different languages are simply dialectic modifications of one common language, brought about by the autonomous life of the different communities. The width of a river is enough to erect a linguistic barrier by constituting a boundary between communities. In travelling through the Philippines one may be told of cases in which an interpreter has to be employed between peasants living only a dozen miles apart. But one will further be told that it takes only a few weeks for natives to get into touch so they can understand one another. Hence it would appear that the diversity is more in the way of vocabulary than in the linguistic framework. A native thrown into another community is somewhat in the plight of a London cockney in a Scotch hamlet, puzzled by unfamiliar words and intonations until he goes through a process of adjustment to his new surroundings. The Philippine census report of 1903 remarks (page 492) that "while as a medium of communication the dialects are so distinct that one tribe cannot understand another, many of the words apparently have a common philological basis" and "there is no doubt but that the Filipinos have a common racial origin and, at one time, had a common language."

Dr. David P. Barrows in a report under date of Sept. 30, 1903, said (Census of the Philippine Islands, Vol. III, p. 648):

> "All of these dialects belong to one common Malayan stock. Their grammatical structure is the same. The sentences in each one of them is built up in the same way. The striking use of affixes and suffixes, which gives the speech its character, is common to them all. There are, moreover, words and expressions identical to them all. A hundred common words could readily be selected which scarcely vary from one language to another. But the fact still remains that, while similar in grammatical structure, these languages are very different in vocabulary—so different that members of any two different tribes brought together are unable to converse or at first even make themselves understood for the simplest steps of intercourse. The similarity in structure makes it very easy for a Filipino of one tribe to learn the language of another."

At the present time educated people, whatever be their native dialect, resent any tribal designation and desire to be known simply as Filipinos.

Race Characteristics.

Although the people are derived from the Malay race stock, it is as misleading to view the present situation under the influence of notions derived from aboriginal Malay conditions as it would be to form one's notions of European characteristics upon considerations drawn from the primitive institutions of the Celts or Gauls. The first Spanish settlement in the Philippines was effected in 1565—forty-four years before the first permanent English settlement in America at Jamestown. At that time the people were far from being ignorant savages. They had the art of writing and there were native states with populous territories. Even at that time Manila Bay ranked as an ancient center of commerce. Trade with China and Siam went on as early as 1250 and at the time of the Spanish invasion there was frequent intercourse between Luzon and Borneo. A Spanish governor who held office from 1575 to 1580, said of the natives that "all know how to raise cotton and silk, and everywhere they know how to spin and weave for clothing." A Spanish official whose account was published in 1609 said of the people of southern Luzon: "All live by their labor, gains, fishing, and trade, navigating by sea from one island to another, and going from one province to another by land."

At that time the highlands of Scotland and the greater part of Ireland were still under tribal institutions. Contemporaneous English official reports speak of the fitful industry of the clansmen, their slothful content with low and unsanitary conditions of life, their turbulent disposition and their incorrigible habits of rapine, very much in the same style as Spanish official reports of the same time speak of the Philippine peoples. The cultural progress of the Filipinos has taken place on lines different from those pursued by European peoples; they are as unlike any European people as are the Japanese, but their present status is as remote from their primitive condition as that of any other civilized nation. To think of them as Malay tribesmen is as misleading as it would be to think of the Scotch as Picts and Gaels, or of the English as Angles and Saxons. The difference between the Filipinos and any people of European stock is very marked, but it will be quite misunderstood if it should be supposed that it is due to Filipino backwardness on the road of civilization that the European peoples have traveled. The truth is that the difference is due to divergence in lines of cultural advance, and the Filipino belief that in some respects comparisons are to their advantage cannot be regarded as an absurd claim. Whether or not one likes Filipino culture a candid observer must recognize its maturity. One of the strongest impressions which a visitor from the United States receives is that this is an older, longer settled country than his own. The churches that are seen in all the towns look as though they had been in use for centuries. The lands about the villages seem to have been so subdued by long tillage that their ordinary aspect is one of formal regularity.

I deemed it advisable to call attention at the outset to the maturity of Filipino culture, for I found that I had to rectify impressions derived from my reading before visiting the Islands, and I became convinced that it is as impossible to reach sound conclusions on the political situation so long as there remain in the background of thought any notions derived from previous American experience with colored races. Apart from actual observation, better material for true concepts will be obtained by reference to the Japanese or Chinese, for the Filipinos agree with these other oriental peoples in the possession of a solid organization of the family, delicate arts and crafts, and a high social polish. But despites these points of likeness there is profound difference owing to the fact that Filipinos have a vital connection with Western civilization in that they are a Christian nation.

I pass on now to the particular objects of my investigation, which will be considered seriatim.

Part I

EDUCATION.

Native Literacy.

It has already been remarked that reading and writing were practiced in the Philippines at the time of the arrival of the Spanish. The Spanish government adopted the policy of introducing the Spanish language among the Filipinos. A royal edict of March 31, 1634, directed that the natives should be taught the Spanish language that they might learn in it the

Christian doctrine. This edict was addressed to the bishops and is believed to have had little if any practical effect. A decree of Dec. 22, 1792, made provision for establishing Spanish schools for the natives as a public charge. But this measure also had little effect in spreading the use of Spanish among the people. The explanation given of this ineffectiveness is that the parish clergy who had acquired the native dialects were opposed to substituting Spanish, for fear that it might weaken their authority and expose their flocks to contaminating influence. This antipathy was intensified as the clergy was recruited from among the natives themselves. To this day the sermons and addresses in the churches are ordinarily in the provincial vernacular. But while the spread of Spanish was retarded, education in the vernacular became widespread. A parochial school was established in every town. The aptitude of the Filipino children for learning their letters and practicing writing, both plain and ornamental, has often been the subject of remark by travelers. A talent for literacy seems indeed to be a marked trait of the national character.

Notwithstanding royal decrees popular education remained almost wholly in the hands of the parish clergy until 1863 when effective measures were taken by the Spanish government to establish a system of public schools. Statistical data in regard to these schools are available as late as 1892. The Philippine census report of 1903 (Vol. III, pp. 593) says:

> "From all the data given no one can doubt that primary instruction in the Philippines was advancing along a prosperous and flourishing path. Two thousand one hundred and forty-three public schools scattered throughout the archipelago, and 173 sets of provisions regulating them, or tending to the intellectual development of the people, are, without doubt, matters which lead one at first sight to believe that popular education in the Philippines had attained the state which it usually reaches in a progressive and civilized country. However, this was superficial only; at bottom everything was contradictory to these laws and provisions, which were nothing but a veneer, a veil which covered the greatest of governmental fictions."

Nevertheless it is certain that at the time of the American occupation there was a high state of literacy, of one kind or another, in the Philippines. Statements that have been published of the low percentage of literacy in the Islands are true only because vernacular literacy is left out of account. The report of the Philippine Commission for 1912 gives 1.47 per cent as "the proportion of literate electors to the population", but it should be borne in mind that "literate electors" are only those who can speak and write either English or Spanish. Literacy in the vernacular is not considered. How great this literacy may be there is no way of ascertaining. The matter was the subject of a special report by Robert L. Packard, published in Volume I of the Report of the Commissioner of Education of the United States for 1897-98. In it he says:

> "Nearly all the Tagals can read and write. . .The number of natives. . .who can read and write is tolerably large; but, owing to the total unreliability of all statistics on the subject, nothing accurate can be stated."

The Rev. Philip M. Finegan, chaplain of Bilibid Prison in Manila, has said:

> "The census only regarded as literate those who knew what we term a modern language, English or Spanish. The percentage of literacy among the Filipinos, if you include those who know how to read and write their own native language, is greater than the percentage of literacy in the United States."

According to this estimate, the actual illiteracy in the Philippines would be less than 8 per cent, but exact statistics are not available. I have been told by teachers that as a rule the Tagalogs can read and write their own language. But on the other hand, contractors say that in the country districts a majority of the labourers employed by them are unable to sign the pay roll. Colonel Crame, chief of the Information Department of the Philippine Constabulary, estimates that over 80 per cent of the Tagalogs can read and write. There is undoubtedly a considerable body of literature in dialect—poetry, drama, fiction, grammars, dictionaries, and elementary textbooks. Piles of paper backed literature in dialect may be seen in the native bookstores in Manila, most of it of recent imprint. I noticed in a bookstore an announcement—in dialect only—of a lecture on Socialism, Communism, Anarchy and Collectivism. According to the official classification, this lecturer would rank as illiterate unless in addition to his own language he can read and write either English or Spanish. To make a fair comparison between the Philippines and any other country in this respect, the same standard of literacy should be applied in both cases. For instance, the small extent of Filipino literacy now officially reported should be contrasted not with the actual extent of literacy in the United States, but with what it would be if only persons who can read and write a foreign language should be classed as literate.

In excluding native literacy from consideration the Commission were actuated by their purpose of teaching the people "the method of carrying on government according to American ideas." For that purpose a common language was deemed requisite, and in view of the number of vernacular dialects and the practical impossibility of using any one of them for the purpose, it was decided to introduce English as the medium of public instruction.

The Public Schools

On Jan. 21, 1901, the Commission passed Act 74 which is the basis of the present school law. It provided for the appointment of one thousand American teachers and before the end of the year 765 American teachers had been imported and were at work. The work has been pushed so energetically that in the school year 1911-12 there were 3,364 primary schools in operation, entirely in charge of Filipinos, and employing 6,058 teachers—male, 4,136; female, 1,922. There was a total enrollment of 496,801 pupils and an average daily attendance of 367,018. There were 283 intermediate schools employing 119 American teachers and 497 Filipinos with a total enrollment of 28,755, and an average daily attendance of 22,748. In the capital of each province a secondary or high school has been established. Schools of this grade employ 109 American teachers and one Filipino. Only 12 of these schools have arrived at the point of graduating students from a full four-year course. It is estimated that the Islands contain a school population of 1,200,000, so that at present educational facilities are extended to about one-third the school population in the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Education, which does not include the Moro districts.

The work is carried on through 38 division superintendents, each having his office in the capital of a province. The province is divided into districts each of which is charge of a supervising teacher who oversees the primary schools. In most cases the intermediate schools, the secondary schools and the trade schools are under the immediate care of the division superintendent. There are in addition some special supervisors of industrial work who report directly to the general office of the Bureau of Education. The Bureau furnishes all books to the student below secondary grade.

Since 1910 the spread of American education has experienced a check, the number of schools declining from 4531 for 1910, to 4404 for 1911, 3685 for 1912, and 3033 for 1913, the average enrollment meanwhile declining from a maximum of 446,889 reached in the school year of 1911 to 344,911 in October 1912. This has been mainly due to decline in the number of schools dependent upon municipal support. To correct this tendency the Governor-General, under date of April 28, 1913, issued instructions for the opening and maintenance of 1000 additional primary schools during the next school year and directed that plans be made to prepare for the opening of 500 additional schools for the school year beginning June 1914 and another 500 for the school year beginning June 1915, thus bringing up the additional number of schools to 2000 and providing for 200,000 additional children. (See Exhibit A*).

On the statistical side the work accomplished makes an impressive showing, and the favorable impression they make is confirmed on visiting the schools. I arrived in the Islands towards the close of the school year when the examinations were beginning. Examinations are standardized. The Bureau sends out sets of questions and test problems uniform for the various grades, and in practical value I thought they would compare favorably with any I had ever seen in the United States. I examined the papers turned in by pupils and was very favorably impressed by their general neatness of form and correctness of statement. The style of writing among the Filipinos is better standardized than among American school children, a sense for form being a marked Filipino characteristic. Strange as it may seem Filipino school children actually enjoy examinations. I was told at the first school I visited that a full attendance could be secured at any time by announcing that an examination would be held, and every teacher to whom I mentioned the matter confirmed the statement. The textbooks used have been specially adapted to Filipino use. The illustrations are all drawn from Filipino life; the people depicted are Filipino people. The Bureau of Education has had not only to establish schools and provide teachers but also has also had to cope simultaneously with the task of providing an educational equipment specially designed for Filipino needs. These difficult tasks have been energetically performed and the statistical results are impressive.

---

* This and other exhibits mentioned below are not available for publication with the Report. - -Ed.

The Use of English.

There is, however, another aspect of the case that should be considered. I had this forcibly presented to me as I travelled through the Islands, using the ordinary conveyances and mixing with all sorts and conditions of people. Although on the basis of school statistics the statement is made that more Filipinos now speak English than any other language, no one would think so on the testimony of one's own ears. Everywhere Spanish is the speech of business and social intercourse. To receive prompt attention, Spanish is always more useful than English and outside of Manila, is almost indispensable. Americans traveling about the Islands, use it habitually. What is more, they discourage the use of English. This was a development that took me by surprise. I asked an American I met on an inter-island steamboat why he always spoke Spanish to the stewards and waiters, and whether they could not understand him in English. He said that probably many of them could, but one would not be treated with as much respect if using English as if using Spanish; that Filipinos seem to lose their manners in acquiring English, becoming rude, familiar and insolent. This opinion I have found to be very general, some persons going so far as to say that they would not have

English speaking Filipinos in their employment. I have found that this antipathy extended into the offices of Government. I met officials who used Spanish in office work, but generally the English language was in use when the head of the office happened to be an American. A marked infiltration of Spanish terms is, however, a noticeable characteristic even when English is in use. Taking together municipal and provincial offices as they happened to come in the course of my travels, Spanish seemed to me to be indubitably the prevailing language. Outside of the schools, it was the exception to hear English.

At Baguio, the summer capital of the Insular Government, I found a different situation. In the Government offices there, English was in general use and Spanish was rarely heard, but the English of the Filipino clerks was not such as would be readily recognized as English. Indeed, American clerks told me that they found difficulty in understanding their Filipino associates in office work. Outside of office hours, English seemed to be little used by the Filipinos. The sports that go on at Baguio draw throngs of Filipino Government clerks. While passing among them, my ears were alert to catch the sound of English but although I remained in Baguio nearly three weeks, I never heard any language but native dialect in use among the Filipinos. A Government official whose work takes him daily through the grounds of the Manila high-school, told me that in three years he had not heard over a hundred words of English spoken by the pupils. He also told me that he witnessed a performance of Goldsmith's "She stoops to conquer" by the high-school pupils, but although it was supposed to be in English, it was possible to understand what was said only in the case of two of the performers.

Increasing the Use of Spanish.

Meanwhile the use of Spanish instead of giving way before the spread of English seems itself to be spreading. The fact has received official notice. The report of the Director of Education for 1908 says (p. 29):

> "...Spanish continues to be the most prominent and important language spoken in political, journalistic and commercial circles... English had active rivals as the

> language of intercourse and instruction. It is probable also that there has been some decline of interest on the part of the adult population in acquiring the language . . . I think it is a fact that many more people in these Islands have a knowledge of Spanish now than they did when the American occupation occurred...The general demand upon clerks is for a knowledge of both English and Spanish. Through the great increase in number and circulation of newspapers and periodicals, there is now much more reading of Spanish than formerly."

There is unmistakable significance in the fact that there is not in all the Islands one Filipino newspaper published in English. All of the many native newspapers are published in Spanish and in dialect. The Vanguardia, the Manila newspaper of largest circulation, has a Spanish section and a dialect section, and most of the native papers throughout the Islands follow this practice. The Philippine "Free Press", the periodical of largest circulation under American control, is published in English and Spanish, and all the American newspapers use Spanish to some extent in conjunction with English. The only purely Filipino paper that uses English at all is the revolutionary organ, "The Philippine Republic," published at Hong Kong. It is in Spanish and English, the avowed purpose being to reach American readers in the interest of Philippine independence.

The report of the Director of Education in 1908 attributes the check to the spread of English to the action of the Government in extending the time during which Spanish could be used in official papers. The Director says (p. 30):

> "...the date set for English to become the language of the courts, it was postponed until January 1, 1911. This action, while recommended by the fact that a large number of judges and practising attorneys were insufficiently trained in English, had a very unfortunate effect upon public confidence in the ultimate adoption of English as the official language of the Government."

The Director, however, expressed the belief that the ascendancy of Spanish was only temporary. He said:

> "The new generation, which will be foremost in the affairs of the Island in another ten years, will not use Spanish for ordinary purposes and their influence will be

> decisive. It will cease to be the language of the courts on January 1, 1911. It is rapidly ceasing to be the medium of administrative correspondence. Probably its longest official use will be as the language of the Legislators."

This was five years ago, but events since then have not been such as to verify these predictions. The use of Spanish as an official language has been extended to January 1, 1920. Its general use seems to be spreading. Natives acquiring it learn it as a living speech. Everywhere they hear it spoken by leading people of the community and their ears are trained to its pronunciation. On the other hand, they are practically without phonic standards in acquiring English and the result is that they learn it as a book language rather than as a living speech. English is rated as a useful qualification for employment, particularly in the Government service but it is certainly not as yet showing any tendency to supersede either Spanish or dialect in common use.

Legislation as to Language.

The record of official action in regard to language shows successive steps of acquiescence in the continued use of Spanish under stress of necessity. The original intention was to make a speedy substitution of English. Act No. 190 of the Commission provided that English should become the official language of all courts and their records after January 1, 1906. Act No. 1427 extended the time to January 1, 1911. Act No. 1946 extended the time to January 1, 1913. By Executive Order No. 44, issued August 8, 1912, the legal requirement was qualified so that it did not amount to more than the expression of a preference for English. This instructive document is appended in full (see Exhibit B). The practical impossibility of substituting English for Spanish in court proceedings and in municipal and provincial government, was such that it seemed probable that although English became the official language on January 1, 1913, yet Spanish would continue in use through official connivance. This abnormal situation was terminated by a law enacted on February 11, 1913. It provides that while English is "the official language" Spanish "shall also be an official language" until January 1, 1920. (See Exhibit C).

There is no present prospect that Spanish can be superseded any more readily in 1920 than heretofore, and from all appearances, its place as an official language is securely established.

Instruction in English.

This outcome of the effort to introduce English as the common speech of the people, although not in accord with official anticipation, appears natural and indeed inevitable when the character of the undertaking and the available means are duly considered. No one will dispute that it is a large undertaking to change the speech of seven million people, no matter how many teachers may be employed on the work. The Commission planned to effect this revolution by importing one thousand American school teachers. At the close of Spanish rule 2167 teachers were employed in the public schools, but these were not available for the purpose in view and moreover they had been scattered by the disorder into which the country fell through war and insurrection. The effort to fill their place by importation from America was only partially successful. The largest number of American teachers on duty at any one time was 928, which was in March 1902. This staff of teachers had to deal with the school population of over a million. The solution of the problem actually adopted was to train Filipinos as teachers of English. The Report of the General Superintendent of Education for 1904 (p. 14) gives this account of the process:

> "In the beginning the process of making Filipino teachers was exceedingly radical. Bright, intelligent young men and women were selected and organized in a teachers' class. Many of of them after only a few months of English instruction, commenced teaching their pupils with an English chart and an English primer. Not only were they entirely ignorant of English in the beginning, but their knowledge of the fundamental subjects of Arithmetic, Geography and History was also very small. In their own instruction by the American teachers, they could be kept but little in advance of the pupils in their classes. Frequently the teacher taught one week what he had himself acquired only the week preceding."

A point which is continually emphasized in the reports of the Bureau of Education is that all instruction is given in English. The Report for 1904 (p. 18) says:

> "The Filipino teacher has been carefully instructed to address even the smallest pupil in short English sentences, discarding almost entirely the use of native dialect from the beginning, in order to familiarize the child immediately with spoken English. Under these conditions, the Filipino child who is an exceedingly apt learner, and possesses natural ability in the acquisition of languages, is making progress that is almost marvelous."

Although I was assured that official regulations requiring the use of English were enforced, yet I was told by persons who knew what really went on that dialect was extensively used in teaching. In view of the process of teacher-making described in the foregoing, it is inevitable that such should be the case. Teachers having themselves but a smattering of English, will of course resort to the language which they and their pupils habitually speak. Indeed, it is common knowledge that this is the case. This is admitted by implication even in such an official publication as the Teachers' Assembly Herald, published at Baguio by the Bureau of Education during the annual vacation gathering of the teachers. The following appeared in the issue for April 1913 in an article on "The Manobos of Mindanao":

> "The Manobo child readily acquires English, and it is asserted that he speaks it more distinctly than the Filipino. It is very probable that this is due in part to the constant use of English by Filipino teachers at these schools, they being unable to talk with pupils in the Manobo language."

At the close of the school year ending March 31, 1912, there were 7696 Filipino teachers and only 664 American teachers, the latter engaged in school supervision or in high-school work. The elementary instruction which is all that the great mass of pupils receive, is now entirely in the hands of Filipino teachers. In view of the conditions under which this large employment of Filipino teachers has been accomplished, it appears that the Filipinos are being taught to speak English by teachers who themselves cannot speak English. It is therefore not surprising that it is difficult for one to recognize as English what passes as such in the Philippines.

During my stay in Baguio, Dr. Paul Monroe of Columbia University was communicating to the Bureau of Education some notes of his observations on the condition of the schools. The Teachers' Assembly Herald of May 11, contain this among other recommendations made by him:

> "Mistakes of the teacher, especially of Filipino teacher, in English and in subject-matter should be corrected whenever possible by supervising officials. Most conspicuous blunders, especially in the use of English, were permitted to go uncorrected in many instances and the entire class to get wrong ideas difficult of eradication later."

One gathers from conversation with officials that there is some disappointment over results and some anxiety as to the future. The Governor-General in his report for 1912 remarks:

> "In spite of the fact that it is admitted to be of vital importance to progress and a closer union among the various peoples of the Island that all should be given a chance and encouraged to have a common language, a medium of communication among themselves and with the outside world; in spite of the fact that English seemed to offer the best solution of this problem, the objections to the establishment of English as the official language have been continued on the part of many of the adult and more influential Filipinos."

The opinion is now expressed in official circles that more solid and durable results might have been obtained by more gradual methods. But as things stand, the Government has spent millions to promote the use of English without perceptible result in effecting the substitution of English for either Spanish or dialect in ordinary use, and what English is spoken is hardly recognizable as such. It is generally admitted that some course in phonics should be instituted to improve the quality of English pronunciation in the schools, and the use of the phonograph has been suggested. But any action taken will necessitate additional expenditure, and the Bureau is short of funds to carry on its present undertakings. The hope has been expressed that the United States will come to the rescue by an appropriation of from one to two million dollars a year for the period of ten years. Organized efforts in aid of English instruction, have already begun. The Teachers' Assembly Herald of May

17, announced the formation of "The Council for the Advancement of English Speech in the Philippines" with a constitution setting forth these objects: (a) to bring together as a working unit those persons especially interested in teaching English; (b) to promote research work and study by which the causes of present difficulties may be overcome and English teaching may become more effective; (c) to collect material suitable for use in English texts especially prepared for Filipinos; (d) to prepare for publication material bearing upon English teaching and methods in the Philippines.

Effect upon Manners.

In reply to charges that instruction in English is attended by deterioration of behavior, Bureau officials point out that the evidence does not inculpate the schools inasmuch as their product has been so largely absorbed in Government service that the supply of public school graduates for ordinary employment is much too small to furnish a basis for the growth of any antipathy to English-speaking natives. The school system has not been in existence long enough to turn out many high-school graduates and so far from there being any prejudice against them, they are sought for by employers. Nevertheless it is admitted that some antipathy exists, dating from the early period of American occupation. The war brought to the Islands numbers of men whose own habits of speech were not such as to furnish examples of polite phraseology, and moreover they found it amsuing to give such instruction in English speech as sailors are proverbially supposed to give to parrots. Everywhere in the Island one hears stories of gross expressions used in good faith by natives as the right thing in English speech. It has been part of the work of the public schools to remove such blemishes which are now believed to be almost wholly a thing of the past.

But after making all allowances, it nevertheless seems to be true that along with English education, there has been a noticeable development of bad manners. This is really deplorable, for good manners have been a marked Filipino characteristic. Respect and deference to elders and mutual regard for feelings and interests beautify family life, while polite consideration marks all social intercourse. If one meets the poorest peasant one can count upon being received with dignity, courtesy and hospitality. Why English education should tend to corrode these traits is something of a problem, no wholly satisfactory solution of which has occurred to me. One theory is that the energetic promotion of sports that has been a leading feature of American educational policy has had some incidental evils. The Bureau issues an Athletic Handbook describing various schoolyard games and organized athletic sports, and the preface to this handbook sets forth that it is "prescribed for general use in all schools under the Bureau of Education." It contains nothing which an American would consider as corrupting good manners. There is a special chapter on "athletic courtesy" in which precepts of honourable behaviour are expressly inculcated. But upon the principle that what is one man's meat is another man's poison, it may possibly be that methods and practices that are innocuous in America, may be deleterious in a different environment. Teachers have privately admitted to me that they have grave doubts of the wisdom of co-education in the Philippines; that when Filipino girls were taken out of their wide panuelas and long dresses and put into the snug blouses and short skirts of a basket ball team, they were liable to lose something of the modest and retiring manners that constitute their greatest charm.

Another theory frequently advanced to account for the alleged bad effect of English instruction upon manners is that it exerts an intoxicating influence through sudden uplift into the "illustrado" class. It is explained that to speak a foreign language has been a mark of gentility, so that as English is acquired, it makes its possessor vain, consequential, self-assertive and rude. But this theory fails to account for the fact that acquiring Spanish does not produce such results but tends rather to impart additional polish of manner. In acquiring Spanish, a Filipino incidentally gets the benefit of tuition in manners through the example of the social leaders of the community, who habitually use the Spanish language. Moreover, the genius of the Spanish language favours standardized manners. It supplies and inculcates set forms of courteous address. The effect in promoting ease and opportunity of social intercourse is manifest to the observer. Hospitality takes a wide range in Filipino society. On various occasions during my stay I noticed that social functions would bring about a mingling of people widely separated in position, means and occupation, the standardizing of manners making safe and easy what might otherwise have been attended with risk of discord. It will hardly be claimed of the use of English that it is attended by standardizing of behaviour and moreover, the genius of the language does not tend to formal regularity in such matters. Free and easy salutation and ironical modes of address are admissible in English to an extent that calls for an amount of finesse difficult for a foreigner to acquire and it is quite likely that what are mentioned as instances of insolent speech may really have been innocent use of misfit terms.

Be the causes what they may, the complaint is heard in the Islands that the public schools are creating a "hoodlum" class—a thing unknown before the American occupation. The Report of the Director of Education for 1908 (p. 12): "It is unfortunate that the attitude of much of the American community and the American Press is outspokenly hostile to public instruction." The officials of the Bureau of Education regard this attitude as unjust and indeed malicious, but they have recognized the desirability of giving special attention to instruction and behaviour. In December 1912, a bulletin was issued on "Good Manners and Right Conduct." The preface says it "is designed to outline for the teachers of the Philippine schools the work to be done along the lines of good manners and right conduct." And it is observed that "there has long been a demand for a bulletin of this nature." The bulletin is a handbook of 144 pages for the use of teachers in drilling their pupils in courtesy of speech and polite behaviour.

Female Education.

Distrust of influences attending the educational system may have something to do with the smaller school enrolment of girls as compared with boys. In the Report of the Director of Education for 1908 (p. 41) this circumstance is referred to as follows:

> "The Philippines are fortunate countries of the East in the position occupied by women. In the social life of the country they have a place as influential and respected as that of the men. The woman's influence in the household, in the direction of household affairs, and in the business interests of the family is preponderant. Filipinos seem to regard the judgment of the women as being cooler and wiser, and it is ordinarily adopted. Women are engaged in all sorts of occupations; besides being venders and hucksters, they are shopkeepers and frequently commission merchants on a considerable scale. There are many women of wealth who hold property independently and manage it themselves. This is a condition which gives the Philippines a great advantage over other oriental countries. On the other hand, while the woman's influence is fully equal to that of the man in domestic and practical affairs, they have not enjoyed equal privileges of education until recently. Lately a number of women have taken law courses in private schools of Manila, though I am informed that none have passed the bar examination. There are three women students in the Philippine Medical School. Of 6,804 Filipino teachers, Insular and municipal, regular and temporary, 2,108 are women. A considerable number of young women fill positions in public offices. The Director of Civil Service states that during the last five year 1,371 young women have entered civil-service examinations in English, of whom 269 passed a teacher's examination and 153 passed a clerical examination. Since the organization of a modern telephone system in Manila, they have filled the positions of telephone girls, and in the stores of Manila there is commencing to be an increasingly large number engaged as accountants, clerks, and saleswomen. Girls do not, however, attend the public schools or any schools to the same degree as do boys. The disparity between the sexes in the primary schools is 137,974 girls to 221,923 boys. In the intermediate schools the difference is even greater. There were last year 2,898 girls and 10,481 boys in such schools; while in the secondary course, out of 1,324 students only 240 were young women. While there may always be a greater demand for highly trained men than for highly trained women, social improvement in the Philippines depends upon an educated body of women no less than upon a similar body of men."

In this respect conditions have not improved since then. The latest statistics available show the following enrolment for September 1911:

	Male	*Female*
Primary Grades	243,550	156,717
Intermediate	19,528	5,896
Secondary	3,130	559

Whether or not better results could be obtained by having separate schools, all the present resurces of the Bureau of Education seem to be employed in maintaining the present schools and the organization of special girls' schools does not appear to be feasible under existing conditions.

Attitude of the Assembly.

Among the Filipinos themselves the principle of public instruction is in high favour and in the matter of appropriations the attitude of the Assembly is one of almost extreme liberality. But the official exclusion of the native language occasions resentment, some expression of which was made in a bill passed by the Assembly in 1908 providing that instruction may be given in native dialect without however interfering with the curriculum, each municipality to have the right to decide in what language public instruction should be given. The bill was rejected by the Commission as it was regarded as incompatible with the policy of establishing English as the common language of the people. In view of actual conditions, the theory that English is the language of the schools might be dropped with advantage. Permission to give instruction in the vernacular would regularize what takes place anyhow and by accepting the actual situation as the basis of action, a long step will be taken toward improvement in the whole system. The theory that English is the school vernacular has naturally had the effect of introducing into the curriculum culture studies in English literature, which under the circumstances operate with peculiar force in communicating a pungent literary and poetic flavour to Filipino use of English. Here is a sample:

"That night, indeed, his house would have been very

> desolate if the daughters of Venus had not graced it with their presence. All of them were beauties such as Raphael would have sighed to paint or Homer loved to idealize in immortal verse. They were tinged with the tenderness and beauty of the Malayan Muses that gave inspiration to our many heroes and bards—those of the type of Maria Clara who fired Rizal and Celia who fired Balagtas with a sacred ambition.
>
> "The faces of the young men present gleamed with beauty like that of Adonis, yet they were not so cold-blooded as to break the heart of a Venus...All of those who were not seated by the flowers of the evening and so drunk with the perfume and whispers of those blossoms, kept their necks moving to and fro like pivots and their eyes wandering here and there like sunbeams dancing on the waves."

This is a paragraph—not at all exceptional in style—in an account of a birthday party published in the Philippines Free Press of May 17, 1913.

Change has been almost continuous in the school system. At the outset the scheme was little other than a transplantation of the ordinary American school system with its traditional standards of culture. The primary, intermediate and secondary schools of the Philippines correspond to the primary, grammar and high schools of the States. Experience and criticism have given the Philippine school system a marked trend in the direction of industrial training and vocational education, which features have been developed as adjuncts to the traditional curriculum. If instruction in the vernacular be permitted, that may furnish an occasion for radical revision of the entire scheme, dispensing with culture studies and concentrating English instruction upon conversational and business use of the language. Such a policy can count upon the cordial support of the Filipino Assembly. Although the members use Spanish in their debates and keep their records in that language, they are well aware of the commercial value of English and desire to have it taught in the schools, but taught so that it will be an intelligible language in any place where English is spoken.

Such a change of policy would logically involve recognition of literacy in the native language of the people, but the attempt to force the use of English as a substitute has been a failure and I can see no rational motive why the present exclusion of native dialect should be continued. However benevolent the purpose, it certainly does not look well to proclaim as illiterate people who can read and write their own language. The practical effect is to misrepresent the situation and to suggest false conclusions as to the knowledge and the intelligence of the people of the Philippines.

Part II

GOVERNMENT

In going about the Islands one finds many evidences of American adaptability and resourcefulness. I saw something of the work that American officials are doing under strange conditions and in difficult circumstances and I was greatly impressed by the courage, intelligence and loyalty with which they discharged their duties. The material progress of the Islands under American rule has been very marked and is universally conceded. The outlines are set forth in a Government publication entitled "Progress Barometer" a copy of which is herewith annexed. (See Exhibit D). Some mistakes in financial policy in the first period of Commission rule had a fortunate outcome in that the difficulties of the situation caused recourse to expert assistance, with a result that the Philippines now have an excellent currency system, the situation in this respect comparing favourably with that which exists in some neighbouring countries.

Material Development

A magnificent record has been made in sanitation and in the construction of public works. An improvement of signal benefit to the convenience and health of the public is the boring of artesian wells which was begun in 1905 and has been carried on so diligently that 774 were in existence on January 1, 1913. The effect of these wells in preventing the spread of disease is incalculably great. The cisterns or streams previously in use were exposed to contamination that was apt to make epidemic any outbreak of cholera. The construction of public roads is exerting a marked economic and social influence. The old style of cart having solid disc wheels with rigid axle have disappeared, giving place to a cart with wheels turning on the axle. Traffic has been greatly stimulated with influential reactions upon the industry and habits of the people. Motor trucks and motor omnibuses, operated as common carriers by Filipino enterprise, have made their appearance on the roads, and the industry promises to assume large dimensions. The roads rated as first class are of a type that it would be hard to match in the United States. The system of maintenance assigns one *caminero* to every kilometer (a little less than 5/8 mile). His office is indicated by a red uniform and as a tin flag like a golf marker is set up wherever he happens to be, he is always in reach in case of need, and if any damage occurs, repair begins forthwith. The pay of a *caminero* (stated in United States currency) ranges from four dollars to ten dollars a month according to the district. In passing over the roads the tourist will find sections that look as if they had been manicured, so smooth, is the crown and so exactly straight is the border of turf. The Bureau of Public Works intends to plant cocoanut palms or other fruit trees along the side of the roads, the *caminero* system providing for the needful supervision and the law abiding habits of the people assuring safety to the fruit. It is thought that the value of the product may eventually cover cost of road maintenance, and the scheme will certainly communicate a feature of stately beauty to the road system.

In the material development of the Islands as in the educational work more gradual methods might have had more solid and durable results. Undertakings were begun upon inadequate information with the result that roads were constructed that were so useless that they have since been abandoned. Waste and loss resulted from lack of proper system. The present Director of Public Works in his Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912 says:

"The work of the Bureau is carried on in 31 provinces

> and in Baguio, which, with the building work that is done in Manila, really makes 33 engineering districts. This distributes the energy of the Bureau over a very large area, and in view of the comparatively limited funds available for public works necessarily increases the cost of construction. This condition is fundamental, however, and cannot be changed. The development of public works cannot be limited to certain portions of the Islands only, but must necessarily be developed over all portions that are at all thickly populated. Allowing for this justifiable spreading out of the work of the Bureau, we believe in addition thereto the work has been scattered to an extent greater than justified. If in each province the work had been concentrated, and road and bridge construction had been continued from year to year from the uncompleted portions of the year before, so that continuous and connected systems of road had been constructed, thereby enabling more advantageous use of equipment and personnel, there is no doubt but that the construction of public works would have been more economical. The waste of energy of the district engineers that results from isolated road projects can hardly be over-emphasized. The construction of school buildings and bridges in out-of-the-way places makes it almost impossible for the district engineer to exercise proper supervision over the construction of the same. In too many cases the supervision must be left almost entirely to foremen who are not fully qualified for the work in hand. We recognize that sound economic nad political reasons have in part made it necessary to distribute the work about the provinces in this way. We claim, however, that the Bureau of Public Works should not be blamed for the increased cost of public works that is brought about in this way, and we believe that the work can be more concentrated than at present, even making due allowance for the political and economic reasons outlined above."

The Benguet Road.

At present harmonious relations exist between the Bureau of Public Works and the Assembly, but one of the past undertakings of the Bureau is a chronic grievance of the Filipinos and is a perpetual subject of bitter complaint in the native press, namely, the Benguet road. This road was constructed to make accessible in mountain resort where American administrators could take refuge from the heat of the lowlands. It was reached during Spanish times by a mountain trail from the West coast, but it was calculated that by locating a road in the Bued River valley, it could be reached more conveniently from the South, where there was railway connection with Manila. The road as originally constructed was nearly twenty-eight miles long, of which about twenty-two miles is mountainous. The original estimate was only $75,000, but the actual cost was $1,961,847.00. (See Exhibit E).

The lowland portion has since been incorporated in the road system of Pangasinan Province and the Benguet Road now comprises only the mountain section, twenty-two and half miles long. The cost of maintenance of this short road has been extraordinary. From the fiscal year of 1906 to February 28, 1913 inclusive, the cost of maintenance and betterments amounted to $792,434.00. That is to say, the road cost over $70,000.00 a mile to build and has since cost over $35,000,00 a mile to keep up. One has only to see it to understand why this should be so. It is niched in the walls of the river canyon, through rock much of which is a conglomerate that fractures and slips under the enormous rainfall. In July 1911 there was a rainfall of 46 inches in 24 hours causing enormous slips of earth and rock with such destruction that it was eight days before the engineers of the Bureau were able to traverse the line of the road to examine the situation. The summer capital, Baguio, was for a time completely isolated. The Bureau of Public Works operates the line of automobile trucks and omnibuses over the Benguet road, connecting with the trains on the Manila railway and by close inspection in connection with a system of block signals, serious accident has been avoided although the road is so unstable that trouble often occurs. On the day I passed over it going to Baguio there had been a landslip that caused delay. Dependence upon the Benguet road is so unsafe that a road has been opened over the old Spanish trail to the West coast. The railway is now being extended to Baguio and the work is so far advanced that connection will probably be established before the next season.

Officials frankly admit that the Benguet road was a great engineering blunder. The project was decided upon without proper surveys and estimates and the Government found itself in a position in which it had either to struggle through at heavy expense or else sustain total loss on all that had been expended. Officials point out that a rainfall of 46 inches in 24 hours is a phenomenon quite out of all range of engineering experience in the United States, so that the enormous force and destructiveness of such a deluge could not have been anticipated by American administrators. Such conditions make road maintenance in a narrow river valley impracticable. The Naguilian road, which follows the line of the old Spanish trail to the West coast, winds around the shoulders of the mountains, and is hence more tortuous than the Benguet road but it possesses superior stability. It seems probable that eventually the railway and the Naguilian road will supply the communication up which Baguio depends, and the Benguet road will be abandoned with a large saving in cost of road maintenance and in cost of operating the automobile line.

The Summer Capital.

Bearing in mind the fact that the natives cannot be expected to appreciate the force of the motives that impelled American administrators to establish a summer capital, it will not surprise one that the native press has commented with great bitterness upon the large expenditures of public funds for this purpose. From their point of view, the money extracted from the tax-payers has been diverted to the use and pleasure of alien rulers. Their resentment is sharpened by the fact that Mountain Province in which Baguio is situated is reserved for the immediate control of the Commission and the Filipino Assembly has no participation in its government, the Commission making such allotment of funds for use in the Mountain Province as it deems advisable. Some comments of Filipino newspapers on this situation are appended. (See Exhibit F)

Opposition to the seasonal removal of the Government offices to Baguio (from about March 1 to July 1) is not confined to natives but is manifested to some extent by Americans engaged in business in Manila. In consequence of representation made to him about this matter, Governor-General Forbes, under date of April 8, 1913, addressed the following communication to the Manila Merchants Association:

> "It has been brought to my attention that the annual transfer of a considerable proportion of the government to Baguio is accompanied by certain inconveniences to the merchants and the business community. It results in delays to the transaction of important business, which in some instances amount to real loss to the merchants. While I believe the good that results to the personnel of the government has justified the transfer of some of the offices to Baguio, I am desirous of making it as little burdensome as I can to the business community. I would therefore esteem it a privilege if you should appoint a committee to study into the matter and to prepare and present me a list of the different classes of delays and inconveniences which are suffered by the merchants, in order that I may take the matter up and see if some way cannot be found by which these can be obviated."

Baguio has been planned with a view to its development as a capital city. The main axis has the municipal centre at one pole and the Government centre at the other. The plans call for a connecting boulevard with a park midway, but these features are yet to be developed. There is a military reservation that has already been beautifully improved, a naval reservation, yet to be utilized, and also the usual country club and golf links. There is a Teachers' Camp, with assembly halls for the annual conference of teachers. There is a market house that was criticized when first erected as unnecessarily spacious, but so much business was speedily developed that it is now much overcrowded. The buildings that have been erected for the use of the Government are plain, inexpensive structures in which large use has been made of the cheap pine lumber obtained in the vicinity. As this region is not exposed to the ravages of the white ant, materials can be used that would be unsafe in the lowlands. The accommodations are scant and the clerks are crowded more closely than would be tolerable were it not that it is an open-air climate and windows are rarely closed. The average altitude is about 4700 feet above sea level, the temperature ranging from a mean minimum of 49.5 in February to a mean maximum of 77.3 in April. The lowest recorded temperature was 37.4 and the highest was 84.7. The sparse forest growth is mainly composed of the pitch pine peculiar to the temperate zone, but in humid ravines the tree fern is found, some specimens having a trunk over 20 feet in length from the ground to the point at which the fronds expand. The climate is healthful and bracing and the gain in efficiency from a stay in Baguio is said to be very marked. Such a place seems to be a necessary adjunct of American administration.

Whatever be the eventual arrangement made as regards the Government offices, the permanence of Baguio as a health resort seems to be assured. Numerous institutions have been established by missionary enterprise, including churches, schools and resthouses. Wealthy Filipinos have established villa residences in the vicinity and one frequently sees their automobiles on the well-kept roads that wind around the mountain sides. My own impression, formed during a stay of several weeks devoted to close inspection, was that Baguio had passed through the critical period, and would remain a place of importance whatever may be the political future of the Island; and that the Government has here assets of such value as to make a favourable showing on the credit side after the whole expenditure on the Benguet road is written off as loss.

Although the Benguet road and the Government settlement in Baguio have been a leading topic of Filipino complaint, that is only one particularly sore spot in a situation that is inflamed throughout. Filipino resentment of American rule is apparently not mitigated by appreciation of the achievements of American administration. The attitude of the native press is habitually censorious. Innumerable examples of this might be furnished, but it may suffice to append typical articles from three different newspapers. (See Exhibit G)

Local Government.

This antagonism relates almost wholly to the organization of the insular government and (leaving out of consideration Manila which has a special form of government) extends so little into provincial and into municipal government that it may be well to dispose of that branch of the subject first. It has been noted that at the outset the Philippine Commission declared its purpose to establish "a form of municipal government practically autonomous. . .subjecting its operations to the scrutiny and criticisms of a provincial government in which the controlling element is American." This policy has been carried out with such success that Filipino leaders have assured me that they do not propose any radical changes in the institutions of local government. At present provincial authority is vested in a board consisting of the Governor (elected by the people) a Treasurer (appointed by the Governor-General) and a third member who is elected by the people. Municipal authority is vested in a Mayor, a Vice-Mayor and a Municipal Council, all elected by the people. The Mayor presides at the meetings of the municipal council (of which the Vice-mayor is ex-officio a member) and with the consent of a majority of the council, appoints the Municipal Secretary and other municipal officials, with the exception of the Treasurer who is appointed by the Provincial Treasurer. The Governor is ex-officio [illegible] all prisoners. He has control of the local constabulary or police of the various municipalities of his province and he has power to suspend temporarily any municipal official upon charges that must be transmitted to the provincial board for investigation; or he may direct the state's attorney of the province to bring a criminal or civil suit if the charge made involves either civil or criminal liability. The state's Attorney (entitled the "fiscal") is appointed by the Governor-General. The activities of the provincial governors are strictly supervised by the insular government and action taken for the removal of officials is not complete unless confirmed by the Governor-General. The extent of the control over municipal actions by provincial Governor may be judged by the fact that it has been held that a refusal by a municipal council to borrow funds to combat the spread of contagious disease is ground for dismissal of the members of the council. But the Governor has no right to inspect or audit the accounts of the municipal treasurer and his appointments of provincial employees is subject to the approval of the Executive Secretary of the Insular Government. The arrangements are such that in all matters relating to the custody and disbursement of funds the Insular Government through appointed treasurers and a strict system of audit keeps a tight control over local finances. At the close of the fiscal year of 1912, there were thirty-one Filipino governors and seven American governors—the latter all holding office by appointment, and there were eleven Filipino treasurers and twenty-two Americans. Of fiscals there were twenty-seven Filipinos and only one American. Out of a total of 141 provincial officials, ninety-seven were Filipinos. Of municipal presidents (mayors) there were 803 Filipinos and only five Americans.

The Governor resembles a French prefect in his functions rather than any American official and the system as a whole appears to have French administration as its prototype. Inasmuch as the Spanish system of local government is based on that of France and American administration had to start on a Spanish basis, the resemblance has had a natural derivation. Principles of local administration drawn from the same primal source—The Code Napoleon—have been adopted in Japan. The system seems to have taken root in the Philippines and it is, in its general features, probably assured of permanence.

Political Organization.

The organization of the Insular Government is the battleground of Filipino politics. Although it is not intended in this report to review the history of American occupation, the following chronological record may assist comprehension of conditions:

January 1899 — First Philippine Commission — charged with investigation of conditions.

April 1900 — Second Philippine Commission — charged with the organization of Civil government, in pursuance of the recommendations of the First Commission.

September 1, 1900 — The Second Philippine Commission began to exercise its powers.

March 2, 1901 — Act of Congress (Spooner Amendment) providing that all military, civil and judicial powers should be vested in such persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct.

July 1, 1902 — Act of Congress entitled "An Act temporarily to provide for the administration of affairs of Civil Government in the Philippine Islands and for other purposes."

The existing system of Government in the Philippines dates from this Act of July 1, 1902 which adopted the system of government that has already been established by authority of the President of the United States, but made provision for introducing a representative character into the Government by the creation of an Assembly elected by the people. The Act set forth:

> "After said Assembly shall have convened and organized, all the Legislative power heretofore conferred on the Philippine Commission in that part of the Island not inhabited by Moros or other non-Christian tribes shall be vested in a Legislature consisting of two Houses — the Philippine Commission and the Philippine Assembly."

The Commission originally consisted of five members; in September 1901, three Filipinos were added bringing the number up to eight. By an Act of Congress approved May 11, 1908, the Commission was increased by one member raising the total membership to nine. At the date of this report, the Commission is composed of four Americans, four Filipinos and one position is vacant. The President of the Commission acting as Governor-General and four other members are respectively, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Finance and Justice, Secretary of Public Instruction, and Secretary of Commerce and Police. All of these offices are in the hands of Americans with the exception of the Department of Finance and Justice over which a native presides. One American is a member of the Commission without holding executive position.

The Philippine Assembly was organized October 18, 1907 with which event the legal basis of the scheme of temporary government introduced by the Act of 1902, became complete as follows:

Executive administration is in the hands of five members of the Philippine Commission—the Governor-General and the Secretaries of the four departments into which the Government is divided.

Executive authority is vested in the Philippine Commissions of nine (the actual membership being eight at the date of this report). So far as concerns members not in Executive position, this authority seems to be merely nominal.

The Philippine Commission reserves to its immediate control the provinces of Mountain and Nueva Vizcaya in Northern Luzon, and Agusan Province in Northern Mindanao, occupied chiefly by non-Christian peoples. The islands of Mindoro and Palawan are practically in the same gategory as all officials are appointed by the Commission. The Commission exercises exclusive jurisdiction over the Moro country comprising about 40,000 square miles of territory, including all of the Sulu group and all but the Northeastern portion of Mindanao, but the actual administration is under military control. The Governors of the Moro Province have so far been general officers of the United States army. The Government is to a large extent autonomous. There is a Legislative Council composed of the Governor, the Secretary, the Treasurer and the Prosecuting Attorney. The Acts of this body become law upon approval by the Commission. Altogether, over one-third the total area of the Philippines is retained under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Philippine Commission.

The Philippine Commission also constitutes one chamber or the Philippine Legislature and in its sittings as such pursues the ordinary methods of an American legislative with regard to the introduction and passage of bills. As a legislative body, the Commission has eleven standing committees.

The Act of Congress of 1902 provided that the Assembly should consist of not less than fifty nor more than one hundred members. The Commission divided the provinces into eighty-one districts, each of which is entitled to elect one delegate to the Assembly. Luzon furnishes 44 delegates or a little more than half. The term of office is four years and the Assembly holds an annual session beginning in October. The length of the session is limited by the Act of Congress to ninety days; if a special session is called by the Governor-General it is limited to thirty days. The Assembly has concurrent jurisdiction with the Commission in legislating for the Island with the exception of the areas noted above which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Commission.

Hence it appears that there are three kinds of Government in the Philippines — quasi-Military Government in the Moro country, Government by the direct action of the Commission in the Provinces of Agusan, Nueva Vizcaya, and Mountain, and Government by the Commission over the remainder of the country in conjunction with an elective Assembly. In practice this association qualifies the authority of the Commission only to the extent that the Commission cannot legislate for the greater part of the country without the consent of the Assembly. Control over appropriations is practically retained by the Commission by virtue of a clause of the Act of Congress of 1902 which provides:

> "That if after termination of any session the appropriations for the support of the Government shall not have been made, an amount equal to the sums appropriated in the last Appropriation Bill for such purpose, shall be deemed to be appropriated; and until the Legislative shall act in such behalf, the Treasurer may with the advice of the Governor, make the payments necessary for the purpose aforesaid."

Chronic Discord.

Such a mixture of different systems of government produces chronic discord. The continual friction is mitigated by the habitual suavity of the Assembly leaders who maintain relations of personal kindliness with the Governor-General and some other members of the Commission. But the Commission as a body and the Assembly as a body are rival powers, pursuing their own separate aims and their actual relations are diplomatic rather than legislative. For the last three fiscal years, the two Houses have failed to agree upon an appropriation Bill for the current expenses of the Government, and the appropriations were made by the Governor-General in his own discretion, in pursuance of the authority conferred by the Act of Congress of 1902

The first failure to agree took place in February 1911 with the regard to the appropriation for the fiscal year ending February 1912; the other failures were in the session ending February 1912 for the fiscal year of 1913 and in February 1913 for the fiscal year of 1914. This treatment of the appropriation seems to have become systematic as the differences which produce disagreement involve constitutional issues on which neither side seems inclined to yield. There is no contest between the Commission and Assembly as regards the pay and expenses of the latter body, its own estimate of its needs being accepted by the Commission. The allowance to each delegate, as originally fixed by the Commission, was a per diem of twenty pesos ($10) and also actual and necessary expenses to himself only en route from his residence to Manila and return, once for each session actually attended. At the first session of the Assembly, by Act 1803 passed December 28, 1907 the per diem of delegates was raised to thirty pesos and the salary of the Speaker was fixed at 16,000 pesos a year, with transportation and expenses for himself and one private secretary from his residence to Manila and return, once for each legislative session. The allotment made by the Governor-General for salaries, compensation of employees and other expenses of the Assembly for the fiscal year of 1913, was 450,000 pesos, which is exactly the sum fixed in the Appropriation Bill for 1911 which was the last Appropriation Bill to be passed by legislative enactment.

The conflict over the appropriation is due to the efforts of the Assembly to extend its own authority and to curtail the authority of the Commission. Diversion of funds from one account to another has been made from time to time by the Commission to meet special exigencies, and it is common knowledge that Baguio development has been to some extent carried on by using remnants of appropriations originally made for the various executive bureaus. To restrain such practices, the Assembly formed a set of rules. A copy is appended herewith, together with the amendments proposed by the Commission and rejected by the Assembly; also a memorandum from Governor-General Forbes in regard to the points of difference. (See Exhibit H)

The scheme of Government by a bi-cameral legislature of which the Executive Department constitutes one chamber, has broken down and the opinions seem to be universal that change is necessary. In my journeys through the Islands I did not meet a single person who thought that matters could remain on their present basis. The general tenor of American opinion was that the creation of the Assembly was a mistake. As to what action should now be taken, American opinion seems to be vague and unsettled, tending rather to criticism than to constructive proposals. The only distinctly formulated suggestion that reached me outside of official circles, was that the solution of the problem was to annex the country to the United States and give it a territorial form of government. The Commission is indeed between two lines, as the ordinary tone of American opinion in the Islands is contemptuous of the philanthropic principles professed by the Commission and the Filipinos take the position that their chief need is to be rescued from American philanthropy. Even in official circles, there is a general opinion that some modification of existing arrangements is necessary to make the scheme of government workable. Governor-General Forbes has favoured me with his views on this subject which are appended. (See Exhibit I). It will be seen that he suggests the desirability of financial aid from the United States to enable the Insular Government to prosecute its educational policy. The revenues of the Insular Government, which amounted to 15,039, 292 pesos under Spanish rule in 1897 had been brought up to 27,397,919 pesos in the fiscal year of 1912. Although thus largely augmented, the revenues appear to be insufficient for the requirements of the Government in pursuance of existing policies. Hence it would appear that the undertakings and projects of the Commission are based upon a scale of expenditure that transcends the resources of the Islands.

Exceptional Cost of Government.

To view the subject fairly, the exceptional conditions under which the Commission has acted, should be considered. Its avowed purpose was "to make a Government partly of Americans and partly of Filipinos". It has put this policy into effect under an Act of Congress which describes the Government authorized by it as "temporary", so that the inducements of permanent employment with opportunities of official promotion, such as draw recruits to the Civil Service of other countries at modest rates of compensation, were lacking. In order to obtain the services of American clerks, it was necessary to pay them higher wages than would be necessary in similar pursuits in the United States, and also to make liberal travel and vacation allowances. Even with such inducements, the service is transient to a marked degree. In 1904, as many as 1100 Americans left the service out of a total number 3328. In 1912, 462 Americans left the service out of a total of 2680.

There is abundant evidence that the Commission has loyally fulfilled its pledge to bring Filipinos into the public service as fast as possible. The number of Filipinos in the classified service has increased from 2697 in 1903 to 6363 in 1913. This increased employment of Filipinos seems however to be due chiefly to extension of governmental activity and has not been accompanied by much reduction by the number of Americans employed, which was 2777 in 1903 and was 2633 in 1913. The report of the Executive Secretary for 1912, states that among the provincial officials in office on June 30, 1912, there were 44 Americans and 97 Filipinos. Among municipal and township officers, including Justices of the Peace and Notaries Public, there were 132 Americans and 12183 Filipinos. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Islands is a Filipino, and out of the six Associate Judges of the Supreme Court, two are Filipinos.

The compensation made to American clerks naturally had the effect of setting up standards of compensation for Filipino clerks and this has been a matter of chronic difficulty. When a Filipino is substituted for an American clerk, he is apt to feel that he should receive the same salary and while as a rule, this has not been allowed, the actual rates of pay seem to have been fixed more with regard to American conditions than with regard to Filipino conditions. In the practical settlement of such questions the different branches of the service seem to have taken independent action. The report of the Director of Education for 1908 makes these comments upon the situation that has resulted:

> "As long ago as 1904 this bureau took the position that while Filipinos, as rapidly as their qualifications allowed, should be appointed to positions held by American employees, they should not expect the abnormal compensation paid to American or other foreign labor. The principle was advanced that the proper compensation for a Filipino in the Philippine Islands should at least be not higher than that paid to an American for the same class of service in the United States. This principle has been consistently adhered to in the Bureau of Education for the past four years, although it has resulted in the loss by transfer of many of its best Filipino employees, both teachers and clerks. The time has arrived when an understanding must be reached between all branches of the service and sanctioned by the supreme executive authority. The principle laid down by this Bureau for its own guidance has received the official indorsement of the Director of Civil Service and it is believed to be sound and worthy of general adoption.
>
> "Much more, however, is involved than mere economy of administration. The unduly high salaries paid to Filipino clerks, surpassing the wages obtainable in almost any other kind of employment, have produced a very unfortunate effect upon Filipino youths. A student or graduate of the public schools has before him the careers of clerks who have been rapidly advanced, sometimes by several successive promotions within a year, to salaries of ₱2,400, ₱2,800, ₱3,200, and even ₱3,600. Inevitably the clerical occupation appeals to the student as that offering the largest opportunity and the greatest remuneration. It is idle to talk to boys about "the dignity of manual labor," the "advantage of pursuing trade courses," or of "engaging in agriculture" when they see youths of no greater academic training than their own obtaining such phenomenal rise in clerical positions under the Philippine Government. The policy of unduly high pay for clerks pursued by many branches of the Government has very seriously

> interferred with the efforts of the Bureau of Education to emphasize the value of industrial training and the dignity of such occupation."

It may possibly be that this difficulty has been aggravated by the distribution of authority incidental to administration by a Commission instead of through a single executive as in the Government of the United States. The office of Government are grouped in four departments in addition to the office of the Governor-General under whose direct administration there are a number of important bureaus. The distribution strikes one as peculiar inasmuch as the administration of Justice is associated with that of Finance in one department, which is as if the portfolios of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Attorney-General were in the same hands. The administration of Police is associated with that of Commerce in another department. Upon inquiry, I was not able to find any reason for this peculiar distribution of authority except the personal preferences of the members of the original Commission in dividing the offices among themselves. Bureaucratic expansion has gone on from five different centres instead of from one executive centre. The arrangement admits of duplication and cross purposes, instances of which have not been wanting in the history of the Commission.

Another circumstance that hampers the Government is want of authority in issuing bonds for permanent improvements. Hence expenditure that should properly be charged to capital account must be met from current receipts. The effect of this restriction is discussed by Governor-General Forbes in the appended communication. (See Exhibit I).

Obstacles to Commercial Progress.

A disadvantage attending the continuance of the present temporary form of government, is that it tends to make permanent standards of cost inappropriate to local conditions. However great the natural resources of the Philippines, they are not of a kind that are possessed by those Islands alone. The Philippines form part of a group of islands arranged crescent-wise off Southeastern Asia, which beginning with

Formosa on the North and ending with Java and Sumatra on the South, have a strong physical resemblance. The great Island of Borneo extends north of the southern part of Mindanao. The industrial development of the Islands in the vicinity of the Philippines, is being actively prosecuted and they are energetic competitors of the Philippines in supply of tropical products. The exuberance of vegetation under tropical conditions of warmth and humidity, afford lucrative opportunities to industry, but cheap labour and economical facilities for carriage of products, are essential conditions of industrial development in the Tropics. It is obvious that the policy of a country whose business is the sale of the products of its soil, should be to keep a wide open door to customers and to manage taxation in such a way as to interfere as little as possible with commerce. But the needs of the Philippine Government are such that they have had to impose multifarious duties on imports, 17,816,247 pesos being derived from this source in 1912 out of total receipts amounting to 27,397,919 pesos. The great commercial centres of this part of the world, Hong Kong and Singapore, have become such mainly because they are free ports. The opinion is expressed in publicity literature issued in Manila that the city will become the principal distributing point for the Far East after the opening of the Panama Canal. Existing conditions are not calculated to produce such a result. Cargo discharged at Manila is subject to the imposition of duties which according to an official statement given to me, average over 22% and the baggage of passengers must undergo Custom House examination. But if the ship discharges at Hong Kong imposts are few and there is usually no Custom House examination of passengers' baggage; and the same applies to Singapore. At those ports, the constant policy is to make commercial intercourse easy and inexpensive, whereas at Manila the policy which the Government has been committed by circumstances is giving the city the reputation of being a dear place. An instance of characteristic difference is afforded by the fact that whereas in Hong Kong street railway fares (stated in American equivalents) are five cents first-class and two and a half cents second class, in Manila they are six cents first class and five cents second class, although in Hong Kong the first-class section is a separate compartment while in Manila the only difference is that some seats in the forward part of the car, are labelled "first-class." A corresponding difference between the two ports runs all through the scale of charges for service and supplies. The representative of an American commercial house that has branches both at Hong Kong and Manila, told me that stevedoring, lightering, landing and storing costs 170 cents in Manila as against 30 cents in Hong Kong for like units. The same conditions coupled with high freight charges operate against Manila as a distributing point. Rates between points on the coast of China are from 65 to 75 per cent less than for corresponding distances in the Philippines. From Hong Kong to Bangkok, a seven-day trip, the rate is $3.40 a ton. From Manila to Cebu, a trip of 30 hours, the rate is $5.00 a ton. Indeed, my informant said that freight rates from Manila to Zamboanga were greater than from New York to Manila. At Zamboanga I was informed that even American goods, particularly American hardware, could be imported from Singapore more cheaply than from Manila. Commerce between the islands is treated as part of the coastwise commerce of the United States. Steamship lines between Australia, Hong Kong and Japan call at Philippine ports, but they are not allowed to take either passengers or freight for transportation from one Philippine port to another. Between Zamboanga and Manila, the law is occasionally evaded by purchasing tickets to Hong Kong and then getting off at Manila. In such circumstances as these, I am unable to see how Manila can become a great distributing point. A less cumbrous and a less expensive form of government, reflecting not American conditions, but local conditions, seems necessary for the commercial prosperity of the Islands.

Party Organization.

At the outset of American administration, efforts were made to develop political support among the natives and a party organization was promoted aiming at federal relations between the Philippines and the United States, but it never had any strength of its own and expired of inanition. One is told of individuals that favour American rule and one is often assured that large numbers of natives would dread seeing their country turned over to the control of the "politicos," but at any rate, such sentiment is not able to develop any political strength. There is no native newspaper that favours American sovereignty although newspapers abound so that every considerable phase of sentiment is represented. The Filipino newspapers resemble those of the European continent rather than American newspapers. Comment and criticism are made the chief features and the scope of discussion and the range of editorial vision are rather striking. Interest in world politics, particularly in the international relations of the United States, is remarkably active. Of native newspapers of more than strictly local circulation, there are 43 in the Islands. This includes the dailies published in Manila and also provincial periodicals. An analytical schedule is appended. (See Exhibit J)

Of existing party organizations the strongest is the Gran Partido Nacionalista which the Speaker of the Assembly, Sergio Osmeña is President. Its adherents have been reckoned as comprising about four-fifths of the total electorate. The Liga Popular Nacionalista is strong only in Manila where it may have the support of about one-half of the voters. The Partido Nacional Progresista extends to all the Islands but is not credited with more than one-tenth of the voters. One of its leaders is Juan Sumulong, a member of the Philippine Commission. The report of the Executive Secretary for 1912 gives the following account of the political affiliation of members of the Assembly: Nacionalista 55; Progresista, 11; Liga Popular Nacionalista, 3; Independiente, 7; Nacionalista-Independiente, 2; no record 3; — 81 in all.

The activities of these party organizations are carried on openly and in a constitutional way. In addition there is an insurgent faction with headquarters at Hong Kong. A few prominent Filipinos went into exile rather than take the oath of allegiance to the United States. One of these, General Artemio Ricarte, became president of an insurgent junta which was organized in Hong Kong in 1911. The organization was secretly extended into the Philippines where it maintains an active existence. Recently some development of auxiliary societies has taken place under cover of social and even religious pretences. The organ of the insurgent organization is "The Philippine Republic" a forthnightly journal published at Hong Kong in English and Spanish. Its policy is set forth in this motto which appears on its title-page in every issue: "We want the immediate restoration of the Philippine Republic by whatever means in whatever form." This motto exhibits an attitude of thought widely prevalent in the Philippines. It regards the action of the United States as comparable to what would have been the case if France in allying herself with the Americans in the war of 1776, had made use of the opportunity to introduce her own rule.

A new party movement has been started so recently that it has not yet had an opportunity to manifest its activity in the elections. Its head is the former President of the Philippine republic, Emilio Aguinaldo. After the suppression of the insurrection headed by him, he retired from public life, occupying himself with the management of his farm in Cavite Province. Occasionally he responded to social invitations from Manila and now and then he made a visit to Governor-General Forbes, with whom he sometimes plays chess; but until recently his reserve on political topics was impenetrable. It therefore caused a great deal of remark when in February last he called together a number of his old associates and organized a new party entitled "La Consolidacion Nacional." A newspaper of the same name is published in Manila as the party organ. The aim of the party is announced to be to unite all elements in practical arrangements to receive and maintain national independence, in calm reliance upon the good faith of the United States. (See Exhibit K).

Views of Filipino Leaders.

I met Señor Aguinaldo twice and on both occasions found him open and communicative. I mentioned some statements I had seen in Manila newspapers to the effect that he was attracted by the form of government in Canada and was contemplating a visit to that country to study its institutions.

I asked him whether he favoured such a form of government for the Philippines.

He replied that he preferred a form of government like that of Switzerland, that what his country needed was as simple a form of government as possible and the experience of Switzerland had shown that government could be made simple and economical and yet efficient. He laid stress on the word "simple", repeating it several times.

This reply took me by surprise as it was the first intimation I had had that any Filipino leader was looking towards Switzerland as a model. I remarked that in the Constitution adopted by the Government of which he had been President, I had not been able to discern any imprint of Swiss principles; that I had supposed the Constitution of United States had been the model.

Señor Aguinaldo smiled and observed that the circumstances were more than such that it was thought politic to take the Constitution of the United States as a model; but that even then the real preference was for institutions like those of Switzerland.

The conversation reverted to the newspaper statements of his views about Canadian institutions. Señor Aguinaldo had had a conversation with a Canadian banker who had been represented in the Manila papers as saying that "The citizens of the Dominion consider that their government is the freest in the world and that they would not accept independence if it were offered to them." I inquired whether a connection that would admit of similar autonomy would not satisfy Filipino aspirations for self-government.

Señor Aguinaldo replied that what they desired was not merely autonomy but independence; that it would be gratifying if the neutralization of the Islands could be obtained by international agreement, but if not, they would prefer to shift for themselves.

I remarked that the United States had a considerable investment in the Islands and that many Americans were engaged in the public service of the Islands. Did he not think that interests of this nature were entitled to consideration?

The response was immediate that of course Americans in the public service would be retained and that the Filipinos would always be grateful for their help. The use of English would be retained and extended. He was having his own children taught English. He spoke rapidly and at length on this topic, the gist of his remarks being that he hoped that their independence would come with the sympathy and goodwill of the American people, and that it was not to be supposed that the moment they became independent they would be exposed to foreign aggression. They would have time to prepare themselves and show their ability to sustain their national responsibilities. As regards the status of American administrators, reference was made to the practice of Japan in employing foreign instructors at special rates of pay. Señor Aguinaldo made repeated expression of feelings of gratitude to the United States and he averred that this sentiment would actuate their dealings with American administrators whose value they appreciated. Throughout the interview, his expression of his opinions was prompt and unhesitating.

I had two interviews with Speaker Osmeña, the head of the Gran Partido Nacionalista, which at present controls the Assembly. To an inquiry as to the aim of his party, he replied that it was the organization of an independent government of a simple form; that American administration had made an impression upon Philippine institutions that would be lasting, and such changes as would be made would be gradually introduced. In municipal and provincial government the changes would be at their minimum. In national government they desired a form as much simplified as possible.

I inquired whether they had any particular type of government in view.

He replied that originally when aspirations of national independence were developed among the people of the Philippines, their ideas of political organization were derived from European sources and they were disposed to take the French Republic as a model. At Malolos, circumstances prompted imitation of the American form of government, although other forms were considered. The present disposition is to adopt the Swiss form of government as being both simple and efficient. (Malolos is the city in which the constitution of government under Aguinaldo's presidency was adopted and Señor Osmeña was referring to that constitution).

I asked whether in speaking of self-government, autonomy or independence was meant. He replied at once, not autonomy but independence.

He was asked whether the United States was expected to guarantee their independence, thus accepting responsibility for Filipino policy without the right to control that policy.

Señor Osmeña said that he realized that to the extent their independence was dependent upon the protection of the United States, it was qualified and conditional, but he hoped and expected that the dependence would be as little as possible. Friendly relations between states by which an independent state enjoyed a degree of protection through the good offices of another state, were not unusual in international affairs. They expected to conduct their affairs so as to avoid provocation to any other country and if they had time to discipline their people, they would not be regarded by any power as an easy prey. The United States would surely be sufficiently interested in their welfare to see that they got a fair start.

He was asked whether in case of national independence it was contemplated to enter into direct diplomatic relations with other powers. He replied that that was their intention, to the extent that their interests might prompt; not that they intended to have ambassadors or an elaborate diplomatic establishment. Their idea would be representation of their business interests.

To inquiries as to the status of American administrators, he replied that a gradual Filipinization of the public service would take place but that Americans now in the service would be retained at their present salaries. He said that instruction in the vernacular would be introduced in the elementary schools, but instruction in the use of English, would certainly be continued. Señor Osmeña was emphatic on this matter of English, remarking that that was settled, that there was no difference of opinion among them on that point. He spoke at length upon educational matters, remarking that there was an increasing appreciation of the value of industrial and mechanical training in aid of the development of their national resources and that the educational system would be developed on those lines. He intimated that there would be such public recognition of distinguished service in industrial pursuits as to make it a source of social eminence.

The Political Outlook.

These interviews with political leaders took place at the close of my stay in the Islands, when my opinions on the situation had been formed by observation and study. I found myself entirely in agreement with them that a simpler form of government would be advantageous, and while it was a surprise to find that they preferred Swiss to American institutions, it seemed to me that it would be quite in accord with the declared policy of the United States to permit the substitution to take place. It may be recalled that in President McKinley's message to Congress on Dec. 3, 1900, it was declared that the purpose is to establish a government

> "not for the satisfaction or the expression of our theoretical views, but for the happiness, peace and prosperity of the people of the Philippine Islands, and the measures adopted should be made to conform to their customs, habits, and even their prejudices, to the fullest extent consistent with the accomplishment of the indispensible requisites of just and efficient government."

Such conformity does not now exist, nor is there any prospect of it under existing conditions. While ultimate self-govern- has been promised from the first, the time at which it may be realized has kept receding more and more into the distance. Indeed, it is impossible to obtain any estimate as to when it may be expected to arrive, the usual answer being that it will not be until after some generations have been trained in American ways of government and the English language has become the common speech. The most definite statement I received was that perhaps three generations hence, the Filipinos might be able to have a government of their own, but even then, its politics would be subject to revolutionary turmoil. If all that may be reasonably expected from continuance of the present system of government is the formation of a native State of unstable character and revolutionary habits, it may be questioned whether such a result justifies the efforts made by the United States.

The Case Against Self-Government.

The prevailing opinion among Americans in the Islands is that the Filipinos are incapable of managing their own affairs and that to allow them the opportunity would plunge the country into disorder. Impressions of Philippine conditions derived from my reading before visiting the Islands had disposed me to concur with this view; and this feeling was deepened by consideration of the unhappy results of projects of constitutional government without adequate moral foundations as shown in the condition of some countries whose natural advantage are comparable with those of the Philippines. Hence I gave special attention to this matter, and pondered carefully the arguments by which Filipino incapacity for self-government was set forth. These arguments fall under the following heads:

The lack of a common language.

The existence of antagonistic tribes.

The prevalence of caciquism, that is to say, the social and political ascendancy of provincial magnates who could use the forms of constitutional government as a means of preying upon the poorer classes, and whose struggles among themselves for the possession of power would distract the country.

Language Requirements.

It may be observed that if the use of only one language as the common medium is essential to the existence of national government, probably most of the nations of the world would have to be denied the right to independence. Dialectic difference in the Philippines is small in comparison with the linguistic diversity existing in some European countries. Even in

Great Britain, representative institutions were developed under conditions of greater linguistic diversity that exists in the Philippines, Cornish, Welsh, Erse, Gaelic, English and Scotch being more strongly marked varieties of speech than are found among the seven million civilized Filipinos. If these Filipinos may be allowed to instal a government of the Swiss type, the supposed need of postponing self-government until English has become the common speech will at once disappear, inasmuch as linguistic uniformity is obviously not essential to the working of Swiss institutions, four distinct languages being in use in that country. Objections to self-government on the score of lack of common language are so devoid of historical warrant that they cannot be credited with much importance. The explanations I was able to obtain as to the particular bearing of the matter on the Philippine situation seemed to have in view political conditions that are avoided by the Swiss system, in which elections are usually confined to the choice of representatives and the determination of public policy.

Tribal Divisions.

I did not hear much of this argument, as regards the Christian Filipinos. They are remarkably homogeneous in appearance, customs, manners and habits of thought. Dialectic difference is as far from creating tribal division as dialectic difference between parts of Great Britain, France or Germany. While making an automobile trip along the west coast of northern Luzon, I happened to come upon the trail of a tour that Speaker Osmeña was making. He is a resident of Cebu, in the Visayan group of islands, but although he was visiting a section remote from his own, there were abundant evidence that he was meeting with a cordial reception. Arches bearing inscription of welcome were numerous along the route. I overtook Señor Osmeña's party at Cabugao, in the province of Ilocos Sur, and heard him make a speech. He spoke in Spanish, but his audience seemed to follow him without difficulty. No sentiment he expressed brought forth such loud applause as when he said that no matter in what part of the Islands they might live, they were all Filipinos, first of all and above all. He spoke from a circular pavilion built of bamboo, adorned with bunting and garlands, the whole more suggestive of a garden party than a public meeting. The company seated in the pavilion included a number of ladies and refreshments were handed around. The sociability that is such a marked Filipino trait extends to their mass meetings in a way that gives them a distinctive character.

Non-Christian Tribes.

Although there are no tribes in any proper sense of the word among the Christian Filipinos, the term may not be so inapplicable to the non-Christian peoples, living in isolated communities in the mountain country. But even they are not tribes in the strict sense of the word. The appelations by which they are designated are generally place-names. The term "Igorot" is a Tagalog word meaning "the hill peoples." The term "Ifugao" by which a large pagan community in one district is designated is also a native word meaning simply "Hill people." Still another of these so-called tribal names is really merely a designation of locality, as it means "people of the other side."

The little Negritos, who live in scattered groups at various places in the Islands are thought by ethnologists to be remnants of a race occupying the islands before the Malay occupation took place. They are timid people of nomadic habit, who lurk in the mountain forests and avoid all contact with other races. The Igorotes of the mountain province of Luzon are believed to be derived from the same race stock as the civilized Filipinos, but it is thought that they migrated to the Islands at an earlier period than the Malay tribes, from which the Christian Filipinos are derived. They are estimated to number over 600,000, but they live in distinct communities, occupying mountain valleys difficult of access. They are intensely industrial, accomplishing marvelous feats of construction in terracing the mountain sides to form rice paddies. Government officials who have lived among them say that in connection with an elaborate mythology they have a complex system of customary law, and that their culture affords evidence of great antiquity. One official told me that in his district—judging by the time they required to do such work by their methods—it must have taken several thousand years to build such extensive terraces as are now found there. There are more than 100 square miles of them, faced by walls from six to ten feet high, and occasionally from forty to fifty feet high, with a total length of more than 30,000 miles. The tops must be level, as rice is grown in standing water, so the mountains present the appearance of gigantic stairways to the clouds. These people practice weaving and carpentry and they smelt gold and copper to make ornaments, but a girdle about the loins with a cross piece between the legs is the ordinary attire of the men and the women's attire is also very scant. These people are often designated as head-hunters, but I was told by officials familiar with their ways that many misconceptions attach to the phrase. It was true that they do take heads but it was an infrequent occurrence. Their ordinary disposition was prudent, circumspect and pacific, but under some circumstances, head taking was warranted by tribal custom, and then the head was utilized and in part eaten with elaborate ceremonies. I was assured that notwitstanding head-hunting, it would be difficult to find communities of like size in which there was less crime.

Pictures of these nude people have been exhibited in the United States as typical of Philippine conditions, but that are no more so than pictures of Pueblo Indians would be of conditions in the United States. The mountain tribes of the Philippines do not constitute any peril to the country, and their economic status is such as to avoid the chief difficulties attending the Indian problem with which the United States has had to deal. A very salutary feature of the situation is that the peoples of the Philippines did not have to come into contact with civilization to learn about liquor. They make it themselves, and use it in small quantities, mostly in ceremonial observances, but they are habitually temperate. They are reported to be shrewd in business transactions, keen in bargaining, and quite able to take care of themselves in dealings. In fact trading capacity seems to be a racial trait among all the offshoots of the Malay stock, including the Moros.

The Moro Problem.

The only respect in which I was able to discover that the argument as to tribal antagonism had any substance was in the Moro country, but even there the antagonism is based on religious difference and does not really follow tribal lines. The Moros—as the term implies—are Mohammedans. Although their number is estimated at only 300,000, the greater part of the large island of Mindanao, together with Sulu chain of islands is reckoned as Moro country. Their Mohammedanism is said to be much adulterated with local superstitions, and prayers and feasts pertaining to the orthodox creed are neglected, but such as it is, their religious faith is held with fanatic devotion. The ethnologists distinguish five Moro tribes speaking different dialects. They have certain ritual observances in personal conduct that keep them from going far away from water courses, so their occupation is practically confined to the seas coast or river banks. This has left undeveloped the greater portion of the rich and fertile island of Mindanao, almost equal in size to Luzon, and possessing a more agreeable climate. Mindanao probably offers the greatest field for occupation and settlement in the Philippines, and there is already a movement to it from the congested districts of the northern islands.

In times past, the Moros played a part in the China sea similar to that of the Algerines in the Mediterranean and in the Atlantic. Even in northern Luzon there still remain high structures known as Moro towers, from which at one time a watch used to be kept for the appearance of the dreaded invaders. The fact has faded out of popular knowledge in the west that up to the Eighteenth Century the Algerines used to make raids as far north as Ireland, making descents and carrying away captives, but memories of Moro raids are still vivid in the Philippines, and sometimes the avernment is heard that if the Islands were left to themselves, they would again become the Moro hunting ground. This notion fails to take into account the great change caused by the introduction of steam power. The Moro sailing vessels that used to be so effective are helpless against a gunboat propelled by steam.

The little steamship on which I made a tour of the central and southern islands, was commanded and officered by Filipinos. If equipped with ordnance, this steamship could smash any fleet the Moros could send out. More raids of the old type are as much a thing of the past as Algerine raids, although the piratical spirit is still active, and furtive excursions by small parties are liable to occur. A descent and robbery in North Borneo by a party of Sulu Moros was reported during my stay in Mindanao, but such affairs are comparable rather to the casual jobs of river thieves than to the old style piracy. The notion that 300,000 Moros of medieval culture could overrun 7,000,000 Filipinos equipped with the resources of civilization is quite absurd.

An army officer explaining to me the situation which I encountered in visiting the Moro country happily characterized it as an anachronism. The Moros are relics of the period when to live by rapine was considered more dignified and honorable than to drudge at honest labor. There is no national cohesion among them, and it is easy to recruit among the Moros for service against Moros, and they apparently take a keen zest in such fighting. Although there is a nominal scheme of grades of authority among Moro potentates, practically each local chief appears to act for himself, going as far as he dares in asserting his own authority, and pursuing his own ends. Authority does not seem to count for much except so far as it is also able and willing to enforce respect. The general situation is such as has often occurred in the history of peoples and it can be dealt with only by strong measures. To industrialize a people of predatory habit, they must be shut off from opportunities of rapine, and to be effective, the control must be steady, pervasive and continuous. Such a control does not now seem to exist in the Moro country. The army is too cumbrous and massive an instrument for such use. When I arrived at Jolo on March 26, 1913, I found a situation that was humiliating. A body of insurgent Moros, estimated to be 5,000 in number, were encamped on Bagsak mountain, about ten miles east of Jolo, and they were having things their own way, as our troops were concentrated in and about Jolo. I was informed that at one time, troops had been encamped in the vicinity of Bagsak, but it was deemed expedient to withdraw them in aid of diplomatic treatment of the situation, and as they retired, they were derided by the insurgents. Jolo, which is the smallest walled city in the world, seemed to be virtually in a state of siege, and visitors were warned against going outside of the walls without military escort. Not long before my arrival, a body of insurgents raided a little settlement near Jolo, coming so close to the city that the bullets broke up a porch party in the officers' quarters. It was explained to me that the troops could soon rout the insurgents out of their position if allowed to attack it, but as the Moros had their wives and children with them, and would put them to the front in the fighting, there would be bloodshed that might shock public opinion in the United States and bring reproach upon our army. It was thought that if a waiting policy were pursued, difficulties over obtaining supplies for such a large body would eventually cause the insurgent force to waste away and the remnant could then be dispersed with little or no loss of life.

This line of argument, it seemed to me, while consulting American susceptibilities, ignored the distress endured by the people of the country who were being preyed upon by the insurgent bands. They had to furnish supplies to foraging parties from Bagsak or be attacked by them. It may well be asked what sort of a police control is that which allows insurrection to gather support and supplies, fortify positions and terrorize the country. It is true that in the end, when the patience of the authorities is exhausted, the troops can always whip the insurgents, and give them a severe lesson, but such a lesson has but a transient effect upon the Moros, who are fighting men by nature, and hold their lives cheaply. The fact that a lot of them were killed in battle will not deter others from seeking the joy of battle if allowed the chance. If constabulary methods were applied to the situation, such concentrations of force as that which took place in Bagsak would be impracticable. If a disaffected datto is thinking of calling out his followers and taking to the mountains, he will begin sacking rice, collecting ammunition, and making other preparations which can hardly be kept out of the neighborhood gossip, with which the constabulary keep in touch, and hence there will be time to take preventive measures. Officers of large experience expressed the opinion to me that it would be wise to turn the control of the Moro country to the constabulary, which in each locality is recruited from among the natives. I heartily concur in this opinion. Military government of the Moro country imposes upon the army tasks it is not organized to perform. It is the general opinion that trouble in the Moro country is the work of a comparatively small number whose energetic and dictatorial character enables them to bring under their leadership many who would rather keep to their ordinary pursuits if allowed to do so. It affords small support to pacific tendencies in the community that eventually the army may kill off a lot of disturbers. What is needed is continuous police protection. The repression of disorder through systematic supervision is the business of the constabulary. In general character of organization and in the military discipline maintained, the Philippine constabulary may be compared to the Canadian mounted police, whose success in dealing with the Indian problem in that country and in averting Indian wars has been very marked. The success of Austria in tranquilizing Herzegovina, a country distracted by age-long feuds between Christian and Moslem and addicted to strife, was accomplished through the supervision of a gendarmerie resembling the Philippine constabulary in character of organization. The proper place of the army is as a reserve that may be drawn upon in an emergency.

Caciquism.

The social and political ascendancy designated as caciquism is a common phenomenon all over the world. It corresponds to what used to be called landlordism in Great Britain, by which was meant the ability of territorial magnates to overawe and direct the political conduct of people about them because of the disagreeable consequences that would attend their displeasure. In other countries, the existence of such influences has not been found incompatible with constitutional government, nor has it served to prevent democratic progress. Nevertheless the prevalent opinion in the Philippines is that the power of the caciques is so overweening that it could not be kept within constitutional bounds.

A work that was recommended to me as the most accurate portrayal of Philippine conditions is "A Woman's Impressions of the Philippines", by Miss Mary H. Fee, and this judgment of its value was confirmed by my own observations. Miss Fee is an official of the Bureau of Education and she has lived in Islands for twelve years. She gives this account of caciquism (page 237):

> "The more intelligent of the laboring class attach themselves as cliente to the rich landholding families. They are by no means slaves in law, but they are in fact; and they like it. The men are agricultural laborers; the women, seamstresses, house servants and wet nurses, and they also do the beautiful embroideries, the hat plaiting, the weaving of piña, sinamay, and jusi, and the other local industries which are carried on by the upper class. The poor themselves have nothing to do with commerce; that is in the hands of the well-to-do. As the children of the clientele grow up, they are scattered out among the different branches of the ruling family as maids and valets... The lower class man is proud of his connection with the great family. He guards its secrets and is loyal to it. He will fight for it, if ordered, and desist when ordered."

Of consideration for dependents, Miss Fee gives this instance:

> "The second house I lived in in Capiz was smaller than the first, and had on the lower floor a Filipino family in one room. I demanded that they be ejected if I rented the house, but the owner begged me to reconsider. They were, she said, old time servants of hers to whom she felt it her duty to give shelter. They had always looked after her house, and would look after me. I yielded to her insistence, but doubtingly. In six weeks, I was perfectly convinced of her wisdom and my foolishness. Did it rain, Basilio came flying up to see if the roof leaked. If a window stuck and would not slide, I called Basilio..."

Miss Fee gives this account of the business activity characteristic of the Philippine gentry (page 242):

> "One of the curious things here is the multiplicity of

> resource which the rich classes possess. A rich landholder will have his rice fields, sugar mill, vino factery, and cocoanut and hemp plantations. He will own a fish corral or two, and be one of the backers of a deep sea fishing outfit. He speculates a little in rice, and he may have some interest in pearl fisheries. On a bit of land not good for much else, he has the palm tree, which yields buri for making mats and sugar bags. His wife has a little shop, keeps several weavers at work, and embroidery woman or two. If she goes on a visit to Manila, the day after her return her servants are abroad hawking novelties in the way of fans, knick-knacks, bits of lace, combs and other things which she has picked up to earn an honest penny."

It happened that at the time of my visit to Pampanga Province, a report upon conditions there (typical of central Luzon) had recently been compiled by the high school class in economics under the supervision of their teacher, an American lady. I obtained a copy, and it is such an instructive document that I append it (see Exhibit L). Its explanations throw a great deal of light upon caciquism and also upon the "slavery" alleged to exist in the Philippines. This report says that tenants "are to a large extent dependent on the landlord, and look upon him as their rightful leader and director in times of emergency... Tenants do group work in threshing the landlords' share of the crop. For most of these services, they receive special compensation. In return for these services the landlord gives assistance to his tenants, protects them from outsiders, and defends them in the courts... The tenant is at liberty to attend whatever fiesta he pleases, provided his absence does not interfere with the daily routine of farm work. This latter provision is never violated, for the reason that landlord and tenant attend the same fiesta... In rare cases, the landlord 'sells' the tenant, and his debt to another. Generally it is the tenant, however, who effects the exchange. Tenants sometimes, but not often, try to better their condition by becoming independent. It is in most cases due to the hearty encouragement of the landlord. The result in most cases is not encouraging. As soon as the tenants become independent and lost the benefit of supervision, they relapse into indolence, give themselves up to gambling, and soon lose their carabao and land... There are many household servants held for debt in this district. Other persons, as tenant cocheros, shop laborers and day laborers, are also held in the same way... They believe themselves held in service by custom and native honor. Some of the bonded debtors who have served their masters faithfully for several years, are treated as members of the household, but most of them are treated as inferiors... The native names for 'bonded debtor' are 'ipus' or simply 'abe', a term applied to servants by some masters. It implies a servant treated as a member of the family... The custom of bonding debtors is passing away."

The conditions referred to furnish most of what basis there is for the charge that slavery exists in the Philippines. In addition, cases have occurred in which Negritos have been captured and sold into similar servitude. While I was in the Philippines, efforts were made to compile a list of these "slaves", and the fact was developed that the one who appeared first on the list has been sent to the United States to be educated. For many years, it was entirely within the competency of the Commission to legislate on the subject if such action had been deemed advisable.

Traits of the Filipino.

I was never able to discover wherein the Filipino upper classes were so different from those of other countries as to make them a barrier to constitutional government. Although Miss Fee is rather a hostile critic the account she gives of their traits does not indicate political incompetency. One peculiarity is that they are more democratic in their behavior than the corresponding class in Europe, a fact which I also noticed. She says in her book (page 233):

> "The land-owning aristocracy, though it must have been in possession of its advantages for several generations, seems deficient in jealous exclusiveness on the score of birth. I do not remember to have heard once here the expression 'of good family' as we hear it in America and especially in the South, but I have heard 'he is a rich man' so used that this good fortune carried with it unquestioned social prerogative. Yet there must be some

> clannishness based upon birth, for your true Filipino never repudiates his poor relations or apologizes for them. At every social function there is a crowd of them in all stages of modest apparel, and with manners born of social obscurity, asserting their right to be considered among the elect."

The Philippine Assembly.

The constitution of the Philippine Assembly reflects the political ascendancy of the gentry, whose power is perhaps made disproportionately great by the narrow suffrage conditions. Miss Fee says (page 99):

> "The legislators of the Philippines are gentlemen born, men educated in conformity to the ideals of education in aristocratic countries, but unfortunately they have not had, owing to the political conditions which have prevailed here, the practical experience of an aristocratic body in other lands. The only large practical experience which Filipino leaders have enjoyed has come through their being landowners and agriculturalists. But agriculture has not been competitive, and when the landowning class travels, it was chiefly in Spain, which can hardly be called a progressive agricultural country. Of men of the artisan class, who have worked their way up by their own efforts from ignorance to education, from poverty to riches, of men who have had any large available experience, or in specialized industries, the present assembly feels the lack. The Filipino leaders are a body of polished gentlemen more versed in law than in anything else, with varying sidelines of delicate taste."

During the time I was in the Philippines the Assembly was not in session. I heard complaint that the body was inappreciative of the merits of American administration, but it was universally admitted that it conducted its business in a dignified and orderly way. It is an instance of the sharp separation between the Commission and the Assembly that the former body which conducts its business in English does not appear to have an English version of the rules of the Assembly. The Assembly appears to have organized itself and framed its procedure without assistance from the administration. The rules of order, a translation of which is herewith appended (see Exhibit M) are an intelligent adaptation of parliamentary procedure to the special circumstances of the Assembly. While the rules of the House of Representative have been consulted, they have not been copied, and the influence of European parliamentary practice may be discerned.

Risks of Revolutionary Turmoil.

That the existence of a class of wealthy, cultivated and influential people, dispersed throughout the country, should be reckoned a political disadvantage was a circumstance that struck me as peculiar. Certainly it would not be so considered in any other country, and why it should be so in the Philippines was a matter on which I sought light in every possible quarter. I was inclined to defer my own opinion to the judgment of those who had long been in the country, and who should be credited with a more intimate knowledge of its affairs than could be acquired in the comparatively short time I could give to investigation, but I believed that I might be able to understand the grounds upon which their judgment rested. The explanations I received as to the particular ways in which caciquism would obstruct constitutional government were such as to convince me that what my informants meant by constitutional government was government of the American type, in which authority is distributed among separate and disconnected agencies whose operation is coordinated by the pressure of public opinion working outside of the legal depositories of power. Miss Fee calls attention to the lack of any reform organizations or civic leagues in the Philippines, by whose criticism and importunity public officials may be kept straight, and she gives these instances (page 98):

> "The American press urges more and more manual training, and the Filipino press, because manual training is in the list of things marked 'best', echoes the general call. But there is no small band of hobbyists in the islands, keeping a jealous eye on the manual training department of education. . .There is plenty of complaint about the Sanitary System of Manila, there are plenty of people to complain about what is being done, but there is no small organized body of Philippinos whose paramount interest in life is fixed upon sanitation and health, and who make it their thankless

> task to harry the department and to preach ceaselessly at the unthinking public till they get what they want."

This assumes the existence of political conditions that make the task of criticism a volunteer function carried on by extra-constitutional agencies sustained by private enterprise. But it is entirely possible to develop the function of criticism inside of the organization of government, and such is the case in the republic that the Filipino leaders regard as their most suitable model. Switzerland seems to be able to get along without reform association or civi leagues, or indeed without any special instruction in civics in her public schools. The national legislature is so organized that the members have little to do save to act as critics, the executive heads coming before them as before a board of directors to answer for their management, subject to the duty of preparing, submitting and explaining whatever action is advisable for the public welfare. Under such conditions, there can be no lack of criticism, and it cannot but be more pointed and effectual than criticism from outside bodies, which from their position would have inferior means of obtaining accurate information. The number and variety of native newspapers also seemed to me to give assurance that there would be sufficient provision for criticism upon the management of public affairs.

As showing the perils of caciquism, I was frequently told that a magnate dissatisfied with the outcome of an election could at any time start an insurrection by ordering out his tenants and clients. The objection would be weighty if the ordinary form of government in an American state should be imposed upon the Philippines. With authority distributed among independent and coordinate officials, by a process involving numerous elections, public disorder can be avoided only through the existence of a body of public opinion exercising school and business influence sufficient to overawe political contention and keep it within bounds. Such a counterpoise is indeed lacking in the Philippines, and if institutions of that type should be imposed upon the Philippines, chronic disorder might be the outcome. But such conditions are avoided by the system upon which the Filipino leaders desire to model their government. In Switzerland the civil service is permanent, and the chief executive posts are filled by the election of the legislature, just as in our private corporations the executive management is chosen by the board of directors. The choice is necessarily restricted to such persons as can sustain the responsibilities that will be incurred. Only those with the ability and experience to stand before the representative body, and present and explain the public business under a fire of criticism, can come within the range of practical consideration. In such circumstances as those, what adequate motive could there be for starting a revolution if a cacique should be displeased by the result of an election? The system confines elections to the choice of representatives by districts and if fraud or other vitiating influence occurs, the direct effect is restricted to the particular district. The powers which a successful candidate gains are so circumscribed by the conditions under which they must be exercised that the personal objective which the revolutionary spirit requires would seem to be lacking.

These considerations leave out of account the possibility of subversion of government through resort to arms by a parliamentary opposition. As no one can say what differences may occur, or that passions be aroused by political controversy in the future, the existence of this possibility cannot be denied, but no tendency of the sort is now apparent. The marked commercial spirit of the Filipino gentry as a class would naturally exert a strong influence in behalf of public order and against disturbance of business. The class of military adventurers whose ambitions have been productive of revolutions in some countries is not found in the Philippines, and civilian influence seems to have a secure ascendency in public life. A very important consideration is the fact that national control has been thoroughly organized and solidly established by American administration. A native administration, taking over the government as a going concern, would be abundantly supplied with means to enforce law and suppress disorder.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The main conclusion I have reached is that American administration has been attended by greater success in organizing the Philippines and fitting the country for self-government than I had supposed before visiting the Islands and that both justice and expediency require that we should adhere to our declared policy of conforming the government not to "our theoretical views" but to "their customs, their habits, and even their prejudices, to the fullest extent consistent with the accomplishment of the indispensable requisites of just and effective government." The present temporary form of government has done its work and has quite filled out its term of usefulness. To convert it now, into what with indefinite postponement of self-government would be practically a permanent system, would be a violation of our national pledges for which I could not find sufficient justification. It is a deplorable fact that the people of the Philippines seem inappreciative of our efforts and resentful of our domination, but it is not surprising that this should be the case. The color line is now drawn with a rigor unknown to Spanish rule and a strong racial antipathy has grown up and appears to be increasing. If on the one side there is an attitude which appears to be ungrateful and exacting, on the other side there is an attitude which is regarded as arrogant and insulting. To understand the situation it should be borne in mind that the Filipinos believe that they would have achieved their independence before now but for American intervention, and this opinion is not confined to Filipinos. Miss Fee, in the work I have previously cited, observes (page 203):

> "When the abuses of the friars here led to revolt and insurrection...the ultimate outcome of the struggle would have been probably political severance from Spain, had not the accident of the Spanish-American war precipitated us upon the scene, and settled the matter by the immediate expulsion of the Spanish government."

A strong national consciousness had been developed before we appeared upon the scene and all events since have tended to intensify it. The political capacity of the Filipinos has been much underrated, through too narrow a view of the requirements of constitutional government and through adherence to American political traditions in a country where they have no historical basis and are incompatible with social conditions. The Filipinos may be incapable of maintaining "just and effective government" under a constitution of the American pattern but they seem to be capable of carrying on successfully a government of the type they desire. Considerations pertaining to the maintenance of peace and order are overwhelmingly in favor of granting them liberty of choice. It would be extremely imprudent to ignore the strength and earnestness of Philippine demands for self-government.

The narrow basis upon which the representative element in the Philippine government now rests should be promptly enlarged by extending the suffrage to all who can read and write their own language on the same terms as it is now granted to those who are literate in English or Spanish. The present ban upon native literacy is certainly not calculated to inspire good will. It is difficult to reconcile with President McKinley's instructions the Philippine Commission's treatment of the language question. It may be that justification for it can be found in the rapid production of a class of natives sufficiently acquainted with English to furnish clerical aid to American administration. But no such need exists now. Instead of more recruits what the Philippine public service seems to stand most in need of now is economical reform. In expressing this opinion I do so without disparaging the great value of the work that has been accomplished in framing governmental mechanism. In starting any business overhead expenses are temporarily large and after the work of installation has been concluded economical revision is the next step in order.

Conditions in the Philippines are so radically diverse from those in the United States that to treat the two widely separated countries as parts of the same economic system will be disadvantageous to both. The Philippines should be entirely free to frame their own revenue and navigation laws. Nothing is more important to the welfare of the country than economic independence.

As regards political independence, that matter is so involved in external considerations that it would be wise to postpone action until after the Filipinos have set up and organized their government, save that we should disavow any intention to hold them subject against their will or any unwillingness to allow them to assume the burden of their national defense as soon as they feel themselves ready to do so. To fix a date at which complete independence should automatically take effect would be wanting in due regard for their situation.

In pursuance of these suggestions I beg leave to make the following recommendations:

That the Philippine Commission be abolished, its work having been accomplished, and that its powers shall devolve upon such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, pending the establishment of self-government in the Philippines.

That native literacy be accepted as a qualification for the suffrage equally with literacy in English or Spanish.

That a special election be held for delegates to a convention which shall be authorized to frame a constitution establishing a government autonomous in character and republican in form, which constitution shall go into effect when approved by the President of the United States and at such time as he shall designate.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

HENRY FORD

II

To the President of the United States,

SIR:—There are some features of the Philippine situation that cannot be publicly discussed without risk of harm to public interests. I have thought it advisable to reserve them for consideration in this supplementary report.

Another Insurrection Impending.

In all parts of the Philippines I found the belief was held by those most closely in touch with the situation that another insurrection is impending, and that it is stayed for the present only through hopes that the policy of the United States under the present administration will avert the necessity of conflict.

Meanwhile, organization is going on, looking towards military measures if other means prove ineffectual. This organization appears to have originated with a junta formed in Hong Kong in 1911. According to information obtained the Philippine Constabulary, and supplied to me in confidence, this junta was established at the suggestion of a Japanese known by the name of Urquico Usa, who is supposed to be a high ranking officer of the Japanese army. The junta was organized by election, and Gen. Artemio Ricarte was chosen president; Tomas Umali, secretary of state; Vicente Sotto, secretary of war; Francisco S. Dizon, secretary of finance and justice; and Mr. Basa, secretary-general. Gen. Ricarte was one of the Filipinos who went into exile rather than take the oath of allegiance to the United States. The purpose of the junta is to raise an insurrection in the Philippines with the understanding that Japan will furnish the arms, which are to be sent to the Philippines from Formosa. Ricarte and Sotto wrote letters to the Philippines to many persons and organized a junta in the Philippines which exists at the present time. The Hong Kong junta has been disbanded, but its work is still carried on under the leadership of Ricarte, in connection with the Philippine junta.

This junta, through its agents, stole from the office of the Chief Engineer Officer of the Philippine Division, complete and accurate copies of the most recent (December, 1912) plans of the fortifications on Corregidor and neighboring islands, which plans were to be turned over to the Japanese, but they were recaptured by agents of the Constabulary Information Division, and returned to the Commanding General, Philippine Division.

There are other organizations which do not pose as revolutionary juntas, but assume the guise of fraternal organizations, or even religious societies, such as the Dimas-Alang. All these societies, whatever their ostensible professions may be, are contemplating an insurrection in case Filipino demands for self-government are disappointed.

The Military Situation.

A topic that frequently comes up in confidential talk on the situation, is, what will be the attitude of the native troops in case of an uprising? The organization of the Philippine Constabulary, while it was a master stroke for the suppression of brigandage, and the support of law and order, incidentally has had the effect of giving military training to a large body of natives. In the eleven years since the constabulary was organized, 19,390 men have enlisted, of whom 4,282 are now in the service, distributed in 124 stations and 36 provinces. The total of all officers is 310, of whom 58 are native—one lieutenant-colonel, one major, six captains, and fifty lieutenants. Officers speak highly of the soldierly qualities of their men.

Thus the constabulary has given military training to nearly 20,000 natives, and it is the general opinion that this force would turn against the United States in case of another general uprising. Meanwhile, the nature of the duties of the constabulary and the semi-military character of the organization, makes it necessary to entrust them with ammunition. Each man ordinarily carries twenty rounds of ammunition, and each company has about 4,000 rounds, a total of about 384,000 for the whole constabulary.

In addition to the constabulary, there are native troops with American officers, under regular army discipline. These troops are designated as Scouts, and on May 12, when these statistics were compiled, they numbered 5,732. There are 1,250,000 rounds of ammunition in Scout posts. There is some difference of opinion as to what would be the attitude of the Scouts in case of a general uprising, regular army officers, expressing a confidence in their loyalty which is not shared by constabulary officers. Probably it would not be safe to depend upon any except the companies recruited in the Moro country.

The total number of arms, the property of the holders, held (on license issued according to law by the Director of the Constabulary by residents of the Philippines (mostly natives) was

6,909 on March 31, 1913. (596 rifles, 2270 revolvers, 4,043 shotguns). The number of rifles in the hands of the enlisted men of the Constabulary was 4,300; in the hands of the Scouts, 5,732; and of firearms (mostly. revolvers) in the hands of the municipal police throughout the Islands, 1536. As almost all of the private arms held by residents arms held by residents are held by Filipinos, this makes about 18,477 arms of all classes in native hands. The number held illegally and without knowledge of the authorities is believed to be small. The only secure reliance of the United States in case of a general uprising is the American military garrison consisting of 13,000 officers and enlisted men. The number of American citizens in the Islands, apart from the army, is estimated by the Secretary of the Manila Merchants' Association at 10,000, of whom 5,000 are in Manila and the remainder are scattered through the provinces.

The Attitude of Japan.

The Philippines are geologically part of the chain of islands of which the Japanese islands form the northern portion, and a southward expansion of the Japanese has been going on for centuries. At the time when the Spanish landed in Luzon, the Japanese were in the northeastern part of that island. A Spanish missionary, in letters written just before he was put to death in Japan in 1597, stated that after the then pending war with Korea was ended, it was planned to make a descent upon Formosa and Luzon. Formosa now belongs to Japan, and the belief is widespread in the Philippines that the Japanese have designs upon those islands, and particularly Mindanao. There is already a large Japanese colony in the Gulf of Davao in Mindanao. That large island comprise most of the undeveloped territory remaining in the Philippines, and it is said that it contains more natural wealth than all Japan. Japan (excluding Formosa) has a population of 49,587,000, on an area of 147,679 square miles. an exceptionally large proportion of which is not arable. The Philippines, with 115,026 square miles, has a population of 8,190,000, according to the latest computation. The opinion is prevalent in the east that Japan aims at being an island empire, which policy will enable her to rely upon her navy for national defense, whereas continental expansion would mean a distant frontier entailing costly military burdens. It is believed that in pursuance of this policy, Japan has reached an understanding with Russia, and that she is now biding her time for the opportunity of another forward movement south, meanwhile settling matters in Korea and Formosa. According to all accounts, the Japanese are carrying on the industrial development of Formosa with marked success.

Whether or not these conjectures in regard to Japanese policy are sound, there is no doubt whatever that agents of the Information Division of the Japanese Army have thoroughly surveyed and mapped the Islands. The period of greatest activity was in 1907, when they were all over the islands, travelling as peddlers or photographers, or in any sort of guise that would cover their real purpose. There are still Japanese agents in the Islands, and the Information Division of the Constabulary have the names and addresses of some. One of these agents is a native Filipino, who became a Japanese subject. He is ostensibly engaged in the poultry business, and occasionally makes trips to Japan. A Japanese agent is constantly in touch with Gen. Ricarte in Hong Kong.

If the Japanese were disposed to do so, they could do much to invigorate an insurrection by running in supplies of guns and ammunition. The organization of our government in the Philippines is defective in that there is no unity of control. If the vigilant Information Division of the Constabulary obtains advices of the shipment of arms, the Governor-General lacks power of his own to take proper measures, but must apply to Washington for the issuance of orders to the admiral of our naval forces in those waters. News was once received which made it advisable to set a naval patrol between Luzon and Formosa, and on application to Washington, instructions were sent to the admiral, but he differed with the Governor-General as to the character of the instructions and refused to act. The matter was again referred to Washington, and fresh instructions were issued. By that time, the Admiral's term of duty on the station had expired, and the next in command thought he was without authority to act. The admiral who was on his way to assume command was finally reached by cable and gave the necessary instructions. Such delays might possibly be very costly and dangerous, and as a matter of proper organization, the Governor-General should be ex-officio commander of the forces and admiral of the navy. The official title of the English governor at Hong Kong is "Governor, Commander-in-chief, and Vice-Admiral".

Filipino Attitude to Japan.

The native newspapers of the Philippines take a keen interest in Japanese affairs and the relations between the United States and Japan are a continual subject of editorial comment. These articles afford curious revelations of the way in which Japan both attracts and repels the Filipinos. According to a statement I read in a native newspaper, an extensively signed memorial for help was sent to Japan in the days of Spanish rule, and the Emperor of Japan forwarded it to the Spanish government. While I was in the Philippines, a Japanese professor was visiting the islands and his movements received great attention from the press. He was quoted as saying that if the independence of the Philippines depended on Japan, the Philippines would already be an independent state. Some extracts from articles in the Filipino newspapers are appended (See Exhibit A*). While some disposition is manifested to turn to Japan for help against the United States, the prevailing sentiment is one of fear of Japanese designs. I saw in a number of newspapers the declaration that in case of war between the United States and Japan the Filipinos would be on the side of the United States.

Non-Christian Provinces.

Outside of the Moro province, there exist also two large non-Christian provinces—Mountain Province in Northern Luzon, and the province of Agusan in Mindanao. Both of these provinces are divided into sub-provinces under lieutenant governors, who report direct to the provincial governor. These provinces are under the direct and almost complete control of the Hon. Dean C. Worcester, the Secretary of the Interior. In addition, he also practically controls the islands on Mindoro and Palawan. These two send delegates to the Assembly, but their governors and all provincial officials are Mr. Worcester's appointees. The Philippine Commission alone legislates and appropriates for the non-Christian provinces. It is understood that any funds whatever are subject to such appropriation, and this is much resented by the Filipinos.

---

* See note on p. 364.—Ed.

I have been told by officials that grave abuses exist in the administration of these provinces. It was stated to me that in the sub-province of Kalinga in Mountain Province, the lieutenant governor prohibited the export of rice, but himself bought up rice for export to Bontoc, where prices were higher. Native Filipino traders were not allowed to come into a certain sub-province, because the native wife of the lieutenant governor owned shops whose trade she did not want to be disturbed. I was told by an official that he himself has seen people beaten to make them attend the assemblies that Secretary Worsester holds on his periodical visits. I was further told that the people were subject to oppression in the matter of supplying *cargadores* in aid of his travels through the mountains; that his escort of soldiers would be sent out to obtain carriers of his baggage, and that people have been beaten and wounded for refusal to leave their homes to work in that capacity. In Mayayao, in 1912, a native was killed for such refusal to work.

These statements were made to me in confidence, and I had no means of checking them through my own investigations, the localities being remote and very difficult of access. But upon questioning constabulary officers, I obtained strong corroboration, and I was further informed that it was useless to tell Secretary Worcester of the grafting and oppression that went on in his jurisdiction, as he was absorbed in his ethnological studies, and would not hearken to statements reflecting upon useful subordinates.

I was also informed by teachers who lived and worked among the non-Christian peoples, that the contact with civilization which Secretary Worcester's administration is establishing, has grave incidental evils. I was told that the people themselves do not use the roads that are being constructed, as they prefer the more direct and shorter trails they have used from time immemorial, but the roads are a convenience to Secretary Worcester in his travels, and also let in the peddlers that abound in the Philippines. I was told that under contact with civilization, and with the new tastes that were developed, the native girls are apt to become prostitutes. In Baguio, I met a teacher who had come there to reclaim some girls belonging to his school. He was in company with Judge Brower, of the Municipal Court of Baguio, who told me that he frequently took school girls out of the houses of Chinamen and others, and that he had reported such facts to the government.

Bishop Brent, in the missionary work he has organized among non-Christians, has selected stations remote from civilization, and is giving an industrial education to the people, so that their introduction to new modes of life shall be provided with a moral basis. The idea was impressed upon me with great force that the non-Christian peoples were being brought into contact with civilization much too rapidly, and that missionary work of the kind Bishop Brent is doing should precede the roadbuilding and governmental extension Secretary Worcester is energetically pressing forward. The non-Christian communities are generally shut off from contact with the rest of the country by great mountain barriers, and I think it may be a sad mistake to destroy their isolation as we are now doing.

The Slavery Agitation.

The slavery charges were promulgated just prior to my departure from the islands. I was told that a list of slaves had been compiled, and would be made public as soon as the report had been submitted to the Commission. But it was not given out, and I was informed that the reason was that it had been discovered that the first one on the list of slaves had been sent to the United States to be educated, where his status certainly could not be that of a slave. The list was therefore turned over to General Bandholtz for revision. I obtained in confidence a copy of his reply, and append it. (See Exhibit B). It will be seen that General Bandholtz points out that the Commission could have acted on the matter long ago if it deemed it advisable to do so. I also append some comments by the native press. (See Exhibit C).

Use of Official Records.

It is well known in the Philippines that Mr. Worcester is writing a book in reply to Judge Blount's book. It is understood that this reply was begun under the instructions of President Taft. If so, when President Taft went out of office, the matter should have been brought up before his successor to ascertain whether or not it is desirable to continue the book in question.

Shortly after the close of the Philippine insurrection, Major J. R. M. Taylor, was detailed for a long time on duty in Washington going over insurgent records, upon which he made a voluminous report. It was understood that when this report was submitted to the President, he considered it extremely unwise to allow it to be published. It did, however, come out in galley proof, and a few copies are in existence. One of these copies was sent to the Philippines, and was in charge of the Director of the Constabulary. This copy, in compliance with orders from a superior authority, was delivered to Mr. Worcester several months ago, and has been in his possession ever since. It is understood that his book will contain quotations from Major Taylor's report. If it was unwise to publish said report several years ago, it would seem to be equally unwise to publish it now.

The City of Manila.

The government of the city of Manila is vested in a municipal Board, consisting of six members, three of whom are appointed by the Governor-General with the consent of the Philippine Commission, one ex-officio member (the City Engineer) and two elective members. The city of Manila is placed by law (Act 1706) under the executive control and supervision and supervision of the governor general.

There are persistent rumors of police corruption in Manila, and of systematized graft with regard to gambling, prostitution, and opium selling. Governor-General Forbes instituted an investigation in which he asked the assistance of the Constabulary.

The investigation was conducted by Solicitor-General Harvey and Col. Harbord, acting Director of Constabulary. They made a report making strictures upon the conduct of the police department, and recommending changes. A copy of this report is appended. (See Exhibit D). Subsequently special reports were made by Solicitor-General Harvey on police conditions, on which he recommended disciplinary action. (See Exhibits E and F).

Governor-General Forbes had to leave the Islands on account of his health, and control passed to Mr. Gilbert, vice Governor-General. A new investigation was made by two government clerks, the result of which was an exoneration of the police management of Manila. It is charged that witnesses were intimidated and that pressure was brought to bear to pervert evidence. I append an affidavit bearing upon this point (see Exhibit G). Col. Crame, of the Information Division of the Philippine Constabulary, a native Filipino, partly of German ancestry, had been connected with the previous investigation in obedience to orders from his chief. He also was subjected to annoyance of which he complained to his chief in a letter, a copy of which I append, together with Gen. Bandholt's reply. (See Exhibit H).

Some individuals who had been inculpated by the investigations were brought to trial in court and were acquitted, the court holding that acceptance of presents did not imply the taking of bribes. I append some comments of an American paper, the MANILA CABLE-NEWS, on this outcome. (See Exhibit I).

While upon such ex-parte statements as I was able to obtain I would not like to express an opinion on the general question of police corruption in Manila, yet the way in which the matter was treated was certainly not a proper discharge of administrative duty, and I think ample reason exists for a reorganization of the government of the city of Manila.

The native press is peculiarly rabid in attacks on the Manila administration. American officials have told me confidentially that the rough and inconsiderate way in which some subordinate officials perform their duties is responsible for much native antipathy. It outrages native susceptibilities when an inspector marches into a bedroom without asking permission. An official told me that he once saw a native girl fall to the ground, screaming with terror, in the grasp of a vaccinator, whose advances she misconstrued. The man did not trouble himself to explain, but jabbed the vaccine matter into her arm, and went on his way.

A great municipal nuisance is the horse corral maintained by the army in Malate, a fine residential district. It is much in the way of municipal improvement in that section, and is an expensive arrangement for the government, as it is over six miles distant from Camp McKinley and over three miles distant from the landing wharves of the quartermaster's department. The Philippine Commission has tried in vain to have it removed. Orders to that effect have been obtained but were in some way frustrated. It is among the places seized by the army during the Spanish War, and since retained by them. The removal of the corral would be a great relief to the city, and an economic advantage to the army, but no interest—army or civilian—desires a horse corral for a near neighbor, and the present location has so far withstood all assault.

Typhoons.

A circumstance that is a serious disadvantage to the Philippines is that the Islands lie right in the track of the typhoons, and are more exposed to the ravages than any other country. These destructive storms form in the Pacific to the east of Mindanao on southeast of Luzon, and advance to the west or northwest, sometimes crossing the China Sea to the continent, and sometimes curving to the north or northeast. The countries south of the Philippines seem to be almost exempt. Hong Kong and points north as far as Japan are occasionally visited, but whether the track is westward or northward the Philippines are traversed. The storm center may move as slowly as eight miles an hour, while the winds tangential to the center are blowing over 100 miles an hour. Records extending over 32 years show a yearly average of 23 typhoons. They may occur in any month of the year, but are least frequent in February, and most frequent in September. I append an authoritative account of them, with diagrams. (See Exhibit J).

While affording opportunities for American exploitation, the Philippines are unfit for American occupation, not so much on account of the climate, as because work and wages are adjusted to Filipino standards which Americans could not adopt without degenerating. The needs of the family of a Filipino artisan are small in comparison with those of an American family, and are readily supplied. A Filipino can rear a family in moral conditions under circumstances that an American would find degrading. In the early period of American control, some of the volunteer regiments were disbanded in the islands, apparently with the idea that the men might settle there. The authorities have been shipping vagrants and degenerates out of the country ever since. A batch of them were deported while I was in the Islands.

HENRY FORD

Ambeth Ocampo

AMBETH R. OCAMPO